LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 4 1950
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 755 .C532 1950
Clarke, Catherine Goddard.
The Loyolas and the Cabots

THE LOYOLAS
AND THE CABOTS

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
AUG 4 1950
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Loyolas and The Cabots

THE STORY OF THE BOSTON HERESY CASE

By Catherine Goddard Clarke

Boston, Mass.
THE RAVENGATE PRESS
1950

COPYRIGHT, 1950, BY THE RAVENGATE PRESS, INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY H. WOLFF BOOK MANUFACTURING CO., NEW YORK

To Our Lady,

Mediatrix of All Graces

Contents

Foreword *page* ix

Part 1

EARLY HISTORY OF SAINT BENEDICT CENTER 1

CHAPTERS I-VI. Founding of St. Benedict Center—Coming of Fr. Feeney to the Center—Introducing some Center people—Initial success and popularity of Center—Introducing Bishop Wright—The Pope's blessing—Abp. Cushing requests Jesuit Provincial to appoint Fr. Feeney to full time work at the Center—Fr. Feeney's record at Center.

Part 2

STORM SIGNALS 43

CHAPTERS VII-XX. Observations on contemporary education—Center magazine starts publication—Definition of a "Liberal"—"Sentimental Theology"—The Catholics of Boston—Success among students—The failure of the Catholic Colleges—The Harvard Jesuits—Resignations from Harvard, repercussions—"The Loyolas and the Cabots"—Archbishop lauds Center—Bishop Wright starts censorship.

Archbishop Beran sends gift to Center—The Habsburg Catholics—Harvard and Archbishop Cushing—Center threatened—Interview of Center students with Archbishop and Bishop—Bishop Wright's method of infiltration—The Liberals close in—The teachings of St. Benedict Center—Father Feeney ordered out of diocese—Doctrine vs. Discipline—The decision.

Intimidation at Boston College—Center magazine ordered to cease publication—Boston College President threatens to "fire" professors—Center writes Pope, receives answer—Professors accuse Boston College of teaching wrong doctrines in letter to B. C. President—Four professors appeal to Jesuit General in Rome—Interview between Fr. Feeney and the Assistant to the General of the Jesuits—"the good of the Order"—"You are merely to answer 'yes' or 'no'."—Professors fired.

Part 3

SALVATION MAKES THE HEADLINES 191

CHAPTERS XXI-XXXI. Fr. Feeney supports professors—Appeal to Rome—Archbishop Cushing "silences" Fr. Feeney—St. Benedict Center placed under interdict—Violence and threats of violence—Policy vs. doctrine—Jesuit Weekly supports Archbishop Cushing—Canonical warnings.

Archbishop stops wedding ceremony—Futile mission to Pope's representative in Washington—Fr. Feeney's letter to Jesuit General in Rome—Protestant opinion—Students refuse degrees—Archbishop stops second wedding, refuses to see couple—Appeal to Rota on marriages—"Reports to the Catholics of Boston"—Jesuit General arranges "trial"—"obedience is supreme"—An "official letter" from the Holy Office—Misrepresentation—"Report No. 6" to the Catholics of Boston—Dismissal from Jesuits—Present position.

Foreword

THIS BOOK is going to press one year after the people of the United States, and eventually the people of the world, were shocked by a stubborn profession of faith made on the part of some Boston Catholics, who were at once silenced and interdicted by the ecclesiastical and sacerdotal authorities in what has come to be known far and wide as the "Boston Heresy Case".

The strangest feature of this case is not, as might be commonly supposed, that some Boston Catholics were holding heresy and were being rebuked by their legitimate superiors. It is, rather, that these same Catholics were accusing their ecclesiastical superiors and academic mentors of teaching heresy, and as thanks for having been so solicitous were immediately suppressed by these same authorities on the score of being intolerant and bigoted. If history takes any note of this large incident (in what is often called the most Catholic city in the United States) it may interest historians to note that those who were punished were never accused of holding heresy, but only of being intolerant, unbroadminded and disobedient. It is also to be noted that the same authorities have never gone to the slightest trouble to point out wherein the accusation made against them by the "Boston group" is unfounded. In a heresy case usually a subject is being punished by his superior for denying a doctrine of his church. In this heresy case a subject of the Church is being punished by his superior for professing a defined doctrine.

I have written this book both in extreme delay and in extreme haste. The fact that I gave it almost a solid year of my thought in the midst of many other duties does not, to my own mind, exonerate it from being a belatedly written book. The long hours I have spent in assembling the documents and presenting the story, without any effort at being vindictive, have made me realize for what a great length of time the Catholic Church in the United States has needed an incident that would bring to light the laxity with which we are protecting our doctrines, preserving our membership, and producing saints.

If this story, to my mind an unanswerable one, shall have in any small measure helped to bring back to Catholic teaching the essential requirements of the Persons we must know and obey so as to be saved—the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, the Persons of Our Lord and Our Blessed Lady in the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the person of our Holy Father, the Pope, the rock on which the Church was built, outside of whose paternal care there is no salvation—I feel that I can safely let my readers wait until eternity to know the full story that only God can tell in regard to what is popularly known as the "Boston Heresy Case".

I shall be excused, I hope, for giving the book a somewhat studied, alliterative title. No one who reads these pages will fail to see the strange connection contained in this title, nor, with a slight amount of insight, fail to reason as to who was responsible for the alliance I am bold enough to call that of the "Loyolas and the Cabots".

My gratitude should be expressed particularly to my most special advisers and helpers, Philip Gammans and David Supple. It was the genius of Philip Gammans which prompted him from the beginning of our difficulties in St. Benedict Center to keep the "Center Log", which made much of the material immediately available, and it was David Supple's and Philip Gammans' careful reading and comment on my manuscript that gave me confidence to know that the story was unfolding accurately and in the order we had known it. My gratitude must also be expressed to Lawrence Supple, Muriel Mary Vincent and Juan Ribera; to Elizabeth Sullivan, Raymond Karam and Philip Swain.

C. G. C.

Cambridge, Massachusetts,
Saturday of the First Week of Lent, 1950.

Part 1

EARLY HISTORY OF SAINT BENEDICT CENTER

I

SAINT BENEDICT CENTER is situated in Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts. It is exactly on the corner of Bow and Arrow Streets, a fact which is commemorated by the bow and arrow on the Center shield, above the door. The Center's wide front windows overlook the Romanesque porch of St. Paul's Catholic Church, directly across the street. Its side windows look out on Adams House, one of the ivy covered Harvard College houses.

There hangs in the long main room of Saint Benedict Center a life-size picture of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII. Under the picture there is an inscription, which reads:

> *Most Holy Father*
>
> Prostrate at the feet of Your Holiness, the members of St. Benedict Center, a Catholic lay organization founded on the Feast of St. Joseph, 1940, in the Parish of St. Paul in the Archdiocese of Boston for the purpose of encouraging the Life of the Church among the people of Cambridge and among the students of Harvard University and Radcliffe College, conscious of their own inadequacy to their task, dedicate themselves to Our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ and to the patronage of His Blessed Mother, and humbly implore of You, Most Holy Father, on the occasion of this, the Feast of St. Matthew the Apostle, in the Year of Our Lord 1944, the Apostolic Blessing.

There follows the blessing of the Pope, signed with his name and stamped with his personal seal.

Almost five years had passed from the founding of Saint Benedict Center to the arrival there of this blessing of the Center by His Holiness. Almost another five years have passed since the day on which it was hung on the Center wall. We hung it in what we believed to be the choicest place, and we arranged an electric light so that it shone upon it in the daytime and at night.

St. Paul's Church is situated on a peninsula, which in this case is a body of land almost entirely surrounded by streets. These streets converge, some as euphoniously as Bow and Arrow Streets, and some not so euphoniously, as Mount Auburn and DeWolf Streets, but all forming a charming little square, not unlike a famous Italian square. We found that in the evening, when the students walked through the square on their way to the dormitories at the end of DeWolf Street, or to Adams House, or the parishioners strolled in the square on their way to "make a visit" to St. Paul's, the great picture of the Holy Father shone out upon them. It also shone upon us who were within.

The history of Saint Benedict Center during the five years before the coming of the Holy Father's blessing had been one of quiet and steady growth. Of the three people who began the Center, two had been called to war. I do not mention their names because, by reason of what happened toward the end of the second five years, they would not want me to. The third person is the writer of this book, who, in the course of it, will tell you why she is humbly grateful to have her name connected with these latter days, the days of the most real work of Saint Benedict Center.

We had not known, in the beginning, just what form the Center should take. We knew there should be an excellent Catholic library; indeed, the need of a Catholic library for the use of Catholic students at Harvard University was one of the reasons for having a center at all. A further need was shown to us by a student who was not a Catholic. He asked how he could find out from Catholics what the Church was teaching without getting in touch with any of its "professionals".

And so we came to have a location, and a library. However, we had no way of letting the students know about us, that we were here, and that we would like them to come in and avail themselves of what we had to offer. Maybe, we thought, if we became a Catholic bookstore, that would give passersby a reason for coming in. The service of finding the right book to answer the question in the mind of the purchaser or the renter was a very real service. Anyone had a right to walk into a bookstore.

We laid our plans before the pastor of St. Paul's Church. His name is Monsignor Augustine F. Hickey. We asked Monsignor Hickey if he approved of our plans. He gave the matter a good deal of thought, and he finally said that we had his approval. Some months went by, and our preparations were well under way, when one morning the telephone rang at my home. It was Monsignor Hickey.

"Can you come in to see me this morning, Mrs. Clarke?" he asked.

"Of course, Monsignor", I replied.

"What I have to tell you pains me very much", he told me later in his office. "It is all my fault, and I blame myself entirely. I have thought over the matter of your having a bookstore across the street, and much as I appreciate your reasons for wanting it, I must withdraw my permission. I do not want you to have a bookstore."

"Yes, Monsignor", I was able to reply after some moments. "I see." And then after another interval, I managed to say, "We have a lease over there, with six months to go on it. May we use the place for anything else?"

"What else did you have in mind?"

"I have a group of college students who meet there for study on Monday evenings. They come from several colleges, in Cambridge and in Boston, and we are giving them a course in theodicy. They call themselves the St. Andrew's Club. They seem to be making real progress. That is on Monday evening. On Wednesday evenings we have been having lectures in philosophy."

"Do you do anything else?"

"St. Andrew's meets for a Communion breakfast once a month."

"Continue with these meetings, if you like, until your lease runs out," Monsignor Hickey said, "but you cannot have a bookstore."

We had set our hearts so hard on what we had conceived as the way to achieve our purpose, that it seemed as if we had been stopped in full flight. For some days we experienced a bleak sense of abandonment, which, we have since been told, seems to be part of the chastisement, the purification by which God tests those who desire to work for Him.

We kept the Center closed in the daytime, and the curtains drawn, as Monsignor had asked us to do, and we met on Monday and Wednesday evenings for the courses in Catholic philosophy. We found, after awhile, that the courses were growing in attendance. St. Andrew's had grown from twelve students to fifty-one, and the philosophy class on Wednesday evening had a good following. We added a course in Church Latin, and scheduled it for Friday afternoons. Without our being too much aware of it, we seemed to be taking form, after all.

We decided on a name by which we would be known, and we dedicated the work to Mary, the Mother of God, under the patronage of St. Joseph. We chose for our name Saint Benedict Center. We had been studying the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, and we felt that the spirit of St. Benedict embraced beautifully the doctrine of community living. Too, we were told that the college students, coming upon St.

Benedict in their history classes, knew him and seemed to have affection for him.

And so the months went by. One afternoon, when about six months had passed, someone thought of the lease for the Center quarters. None of us was sure of the date of expiration, but we vaguely remembered that it was the sort of lease which renewed itself automatically. Monsignor Hickey had said we might go on only until our lease expired. It took us a little while to locate the document. We had become so absorbed in our work that we couldn't remember which of us had it. When we found it, we gasped. Our contract ran out that day, and our new tenure would begin on the following day. Whatever we did had to be done at once.

Monsignor Hickey is a formal little man. We hadn't seen him to talk to since the day he had made his decision about us, and each of us admitted that we and Monsignor's altar boys had one thing in common—we were scared of the Monsignor.

Well, there was nothing to be done but go and see Monsignor Hickey. One of us did just that—and came back with the Monsignor. Formal as he appears in his everyday clothes, he looked even more formal on this occasion by reason of the red robes and biretta which he was wearing. His attire impressed us, and his expression told us he was prepared for anything.

What we said to him I do not remember. But I have never forgotten what he answered. "It has never been my purpose", he told us, "to stop a work that is doing good. What you report to me of your year's work, the number of students who have been helped, the attendance at your classes, all is good. As long as you can take care of the financial responsibility of it, I can see no objection to your renewing your lease and going on with your work. God bless you. Good afternoon."

We were relieved and overjoyed. When we closed our door and walked out into the little square that night, we did so with assurance. We had the approval of the pastor of the parish, we *were* wanted, we had made no mistake, we did have work to do, the work was for God, and His minister had told us so. St. Benedict's had come out of the catacombs. It was St. Benedict's before the world—small, yes, but truly a part of integral Catholic life.

St. Benedict's is back in the catacombs again. That is the subject of this book. St. Benedict's is in the catacombs, but it is truly a part of the Church, and when it rises, it prays that it will be in a Church free of the palsying effects of Liberalism, for the purging of which St. Benedict's was willing to go back into the catacombs.

II

OUR work was not immediately increased under our new status. Monsignor Hickey did not remember to tell the chaplain of the Harvard Catholic Club, who at that time was Father Francis Greene, that we had his approval, and so, although we had longed for the advice and direction of a priest at the Center, we were obliged to go on on our own, as best we could. The officers of the Harvard Catholic Club dropped in one afternoon, and said they were delighted to find such a place for the use of Catholic students at Harvard, and they went away saying that they would discuss St. Benedict's with Father Greene when they had their next meeting with him. Weeks went by, however, and they did not return.

One afternoon one of my friends brought a priest to see us.

"This is my dear friend, Father Leonard Feeney", she said. "I was talking with Father about the Center, and he said he would like to see it."

We were most interested to meet Father Leonard Feeney. We had heard a great deal about him, and we had read his books. He was teaching at Weston College, the Jesuit seminary, at this time. He asked us some questions about the Center work, and his interest warmed us. We had been anxious to talk to a priest about the Center, and Father Feeney seemed to understand what we were trying to do. We told him all about it.

"It is a wonderful idea", he told us. "A beautiful work. Don't let discouragement or anything stop you from doing it. Our Lord and Our Lady will bless you."

We were deeply grateful to Father Feeney. It was the first unsolicited priestly encouragement we had had for the Center. We hoped he would come again.

Father Feeney did drop in again. He came one Wednesday night to the philosophy course, and he joined in the discussion which took place after the lecture. One of the students who was present asked Father a question. When the meeting was over, the student came to me and said:

"How can I talk some more to Father Feeney? That was the most satisfactory answer I have ever received. The question was one which has been bothering me for a long time."

"I will ask Father when it would be possible for you to meet him again", I answered. I related this conversation to Father Feeney later on.

"Don't you have a priest here?" Father asked me.

"No, Father", I told him.

"I am busy at Weston, as you know," Father Feeney said, "but I can find time to take care of this student, and whenever I can help you in any way, you just let me know."

After that, several students found their way out to Weston College, a distance of twenty miles, to consult Father. And the Center life went quietly on. Several of our girls were planning to enter convents at the end of the term. We had built a shrine to Our Lady at the far end of the long, main room, and we often gathered down there to ask Her to fill the Center with grace.

In the fall of 1941, the officers of the Harvard Catholic Club came to see me again. These officers were Joseph Bothwell and Arthur Egan.

"You know, Mrs. Clarke," they said, "we've been thinking St. Ben's over. We've always wanted to have a place where we could meet and talk things out among ourselves—where we could have a real discussion. No priest or anything. Would you let us have the Center for that sort of thing, say once or twice a week, in the evening?"

I replied that we would be delighted.

The boys came in again a few days later. They had chosen the evening, Thursday evening. They had put a notice in the college newspaper. The first meeting of the Harvard Catholic Club at St. Benedict Center would take place the following week.

We learned a great deal from that first meeting. (The boys had invited us to sit in on it.) We found that when some student made a point which he thought was the end-all of the argument, his opponent felled him by the simple process of putting to him this question:

"How do you know that? Can you say that with authority?" And the student was obliged to admit that he could not.

We talked it over afterward.

"I guess we have to have some kind of authority", Arthur Egan decided. "Not a priest, though. That takes it out of the amateur class."

"What would you think of someone on the Harvard faculty?" I asked him. "I know a Catholic who might be what you need."

"Fine, let's get him", the boys agreed.

And so we had our second session. The new chairman, from the Harvard faculty and a Catholic, sat up front, and was modestly authoritative. We lent him support. The meeting was a little more ordered, but not one bit more conclusive.

This time, some girls from Radcliffe College sat in with the Harvard boys on the "post-mortem", and a Radcliffe girl named Betty Reichert supplied the solution:

"We've simply got to have a priest", she said. "For religious matters there's only one authority, and that is a priest. We can get a nice one, one who understands us, and yet is above us and can teach us."

"Just who would that be—a priest who would understand us?" Joe Bothwell asked.

"I know just the one", Betty answered. "Father Leonard Feeney. He was here this afternoon, and since tomorrow is Halloween, we got to talking about the meaning of Allhallows. None of us knew its origin, and Father Feeney's explanation was fascinating. If he could explain religion to us that way, and I think he can, it would be splendid. Could we have Father Feeney?" she asked me.

"Well, I don't know", I told her. "Father is teaching at Weston College. He is an important man. He has written many books; he is popular and in demand everywhere for lectures and sermons; he is going to give a series of talks over the radio for the National Broadcasting Company. We are so small."

"Still," said Betty, "I don't think Father would let any broadcast interfere with his work among people. He said that personal work was what he liked best."

"That's right", said one of the boys. "When Father Feeney was on the staff of the Jesuit weekly, *America,* he had to be intellectual, and his only comfort was in talking with the New York taxi drivers."

"What happened?" asked a matter-of-fact student.

"Well, some of Father's best stories are his taxi-cab stories, and some of his very best friends are these drivers. They are also some of his best conversions, including Jerry Hohenstein, at the corner of Broadway and 108th Street, a Jew whom Father brought into the Faith and never has stopped talking about."

"Well, there's no harm in asking Father Feeney to come and sit in on our meetings", Arthur Egan broke in. "Will you write and ask Father then, Betty?"

Betty wrote to Weston College, and asked Father Leonard Feeney if he would come down to St. Benedict Center and address the Catholic students of Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges every Thursday evening. Father Feeney wrote back that he would be honored to do that, and that he was most happy that she should ask him.

That is how Father Feeney's famous Thursday nights at St. Benedict Center began. Thousands of people have attended them. During the war, boys came into the Center to see us, saying that they had timed their visit so they would hear Father Feeney on Thursday evening. We asked one Navy boy how he had known about it. He said he had heard it on every ship to which he had been assigned in the Navy. He had managed to find on every ship one man, at least, who had listened to Father, and "Cambridge, Mass." meant to him Father Leonard Feeney and St. Benedict Center on Thursday night.

People laughingly told us, after Thursday evenings were well under way, that the Center walls viewed from across the street on Thursday nights literally appeared to bulge. Students filled the aisles, jammed the doorway, and stood on the sidewalk, at each window.

When the old students came back to Cambridge, they always came back for Thursday evening. When parents came, it was always for Thursday evening. Over the years, Father's friends, men of letters, artists, publishers, musicians, priests, all came to St. Benedict Center, and always for Thursday evening.

III

THE Center's main room is a long one, and the upper half of it is furnished like a living room. It is a very pleasant living room, with large, comfortable chairs, leather davenports, heavy rugs, and many books. The second half of the room has long library tables, for study, and bookshelves along the walls. Gradually it became necessary to move the library tables for the evening lectures, and to use every available inch of floor space in order to accommodate as many people as possible. It was in the upper part of the Center room that Father Feeney began his evening lectures. He would come down from Weston College on Thursday afternoon, and would see students until dinner time. So many students asked to see him that it finally became necessary for Father to come into Cambridge several days a week, and it eventually developed that when he did not have duties at Weston College he was to be found hard at work at St. Benedict Center.

We could scarcely believe the wealth of riches which Father Feeney brought to the Center, in himself. He brought us the example of real holiness, of priestly zeal. He brought us his great love for Our Lady, which everyone who has ever known him has acknowledged to be extraordinarily deep and beautiful. He brought us the fruits of his scholarship, of his many years of learning, here and abroad, in the Jesuit Order. His rich humor, his poetry, his love of the poets, his story-telling, at which he is a master, filled us with joy. He seemed to think everyone was good, everyone (of us) a genius, everyone almost a saint. We expanded under the warmth and charm of it. If we weren't saints, we would try to be. At least we would work hard for God, and let Him take care of the saint part of us. It was in Father Feeney's spiritual direction that we realized what a gift God had given us. Bishop John Wright, Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Boston, recalled this to me in a conversation I had with him some years later, when we were discussing the many courses which had been added to the Center schedule.

"I should be very sorry", Bishop Wright told me, "if St. Benedict Center's school became so large that Father Feeney would, in his preoccupation with the studies, be taken away from his duties as spiritual director. He is a genius in the directions of souls."

In his spiritual direction, Father Feeney brought out, by his patience and belief in us, the hidden aspirations and half-formed longings for God that we had not expressed even to ourselves. However, Father told us our faults also. This he did when we least expected it. In the withering blast of his denunciation of whatever fault in us he wished to uproot, it was borne in on us that he saw with remarkable clarity the shadows in our souls, as well as the light. Very often he would preface his scolding with the remark,

"You have a very selfish streak in you." Or, "Do you want my direction, or do you not? Are you trying to get me to tell you what you want me to tell you, or will you take what Our Lady has given me to tell you?"

He would never accept the direction of someone he was not sure he could help. Well-known Catholics have travelled to the Center from cities distant to Boston to ask Father Feeney if he would undertake their spiritual direction, only to be told the name of an excellent priest in their own city who Father thought could much better direct them.

I don't remember just when it happened, but one day Arthur Egan, in his official capacity as vice-president of the Harvard Catholic Club, telephoned me. "It's all a mistake", he said, "about Father Greene, the Catholic Club, and St. Ben's. I've been talking with Father Greene, and I find that Monsignor Hickey somehow forgot to tell him that St. Benedict's is approved by him. Could you come over and have a talk with Father Greene?"

"I am very happy about the situation now", Father Greene said to us. "Monsignor just forgot to tell me, and we have learned to be a little reserved about outside help with the Harvard Catholic Club. In years past, on many occasions people have come to us and said, 'You just don't know anything about it. The Club isn't being handled properly. We will show you how to do it.' We believed them, and allowed them to go ahead. In a short while they got tired and let the whole thing drop. Sometimes they even turned out to be anti-clerical. But I'm entirely satisfied about you now. I will come over and see you some day."

Father Greene came over the following afternoon. We showed him around the Center, told him about the program, described Father Feeney's work, and the courses. Father Greene said he was delighted, and he would encourage the students to come to the Center.

He came over to see us again on the following Saturday afternoon, during a lull in the confessional hours at St. Paul's. It was the first time we had the consoling experience of seeing what was later a familiar sight in the little square—the curates of St. Paul's parish in cassock and biretta on their way across the street to visit St. Benedict Center.

"My coming at this time is deliberate", Father Greene told us on that Saturday afternoon. "I want the people of our parish to see me coming in. It is one way of telling them that you are all right." He smiled as he said it, and he won our hearts completely. He was a hard working young curate, and had come to know the problems in connection with the Harvard Catholic Club very well, in the ten years he had struggled with it.

Father Greene chose Tuesday night at the Center for his club. Father Feeney was delighted at the new turn of events, and he and Father Greene became very good friends.

The darkest cloud in our sky was the war. It was always threatening to take our boys, and even when it brought to us new men who were enrolled in the courses at Harvard, it also snatched them away when we had come to know and love them, and when they had settled down for real study with us. The war took Father Greene from us. So many priests had answered the call for Catholic chaplains during the war, that it was necessary to move the remaining priests around in order that the parishes would not be left understaffed any more than was necessary. It was in this redistribution, as we understood it, that Father Greene was transferred to St. Theresa's Church in West Roxbury. We so regretted this that I went over and asked Monsignor Hickey if something could not be done about it.

"No," Monsignor replied, "nothing can be done. Do you know which of the other priests here you would like to take Father Greene's place?"

I could think of no one immediately, but after some thought I said to him, "Father Fitzpatrick spoke at the Center the other evening about his work with the Legion of Mary, and we liked him very much."

"I will send you Father Fitzpatrick. He will not be able to come until the fall, but he will be over then. I am sure you will continue to like him very much."

We did come to know and love Father Fitzpatrick. While he was with us he gave to Father Feeney and to St. Benedict Center the loving protection under which it was able to go ahead and do its work. When he was given his own parish, and had to leave us, several years later, our sorrow was very real at losing him. If Father Fitzpatrick were with us, we have thought many times, much of what we have suffered since his going would not have been allowed to come upon us.

However, so beautiful is the Providence of God, it is true also that neither would we have been able to awaken the world to an awareness of doctrine, once more. Catholics had become vigilant about Communism, sociology, slum clearance, the Community Chest, cancer, and those things which pertain to man's temporal good, but that which alone protects the precious Deposit of Faith, the guarantee of their eternal good,—Catholic doctrine—that had been long neglected. Liberalism had been eating in upon it until the virility, the substance of doctrine was fast disappearing.

Neither Father Greene nor Father Fitzpatrick, I am sure, would say that Father Feeney was ever any less a priest than they, that they understood orders any better than he. Nor could they say that St. Benedict Center, too, had not had its share of obeying orders with regard to its priests. As this story unfolds, and you recall that all through the controversy between St. Benedict Center and the local Church authorities the cry of "Discipline!" was raised, on the one hand, and "Doctrine!", on the other, perhaps you will reflect that St. Benedict Center must have had a mighty reason for its stand of Doctrine over Discipline. For it had. The controversy was, in the beginning, a question entirely of doctrine. St. Benedict Center had been trained through discipline, and it had been its joy to obey.

IV

IN FEBRUARY of 1942, David Donald Supple came to us. His picture was familiar to newspaper readers, in the days which followed upon the Holy Week (1949) publication of St. Benedict Center's doctrinal controversy, as one of the four teachers who were fired by the Jesuits for holding that it is the teaching of the Catholic Church that no one can be saved outside it, nor without personal submission to the Pope, its visible head. Newspaper publicity was very far from David's thoughts when he came to St. Benedict Center. He had heard about the Center while a student at Brown University where he was a member, and later president, of the Newman Club. During his college days, David frequently visited a priory not far from Providence. It was on one of his visits there, just the week-end before his coming to us, that someone spoke to him about St. Benedict Center and David came over from his home in Newton to investigate. He had been looking for some such thing to fill in his time while he was working in nearby Watertown. He had one more year of college before receiving his degree, but he could not complete it until after the war since his older brother was away from the family, with the Navy. His father, a well-known Boston surgeon, had died several years before, and David's younger brothers were still in school.

So much a part of the Center did David become, and so devotedly did he study, that Father Feeney was able to say of him, when he came to his defense during the controversy: "There is almost no point of Catholic doctrine or program on which David has not a seasoned judgment, expressed with his inimitable grace and ease. Strong faith has a tradition in his family. His two uncles, Monsignor Supple and Dr. James Supple, are imperishable memories in the minds of all unequivocal Boston Catholics."

David worked with Fred Farrell a great deal in those days at the Center, in 1942. Fred had graduated from Harvard, and was waiting for induction into the Army, where he had made application for admission to the Language School. There are no two Center boys of whose lives Father Feeney and I were more happy to become a part than David Supple's and Fred Farrell's. Fred's mother and father gave us their warm support all through the years. Mr. Farrell, a Harvard man himself, telephoned me, soon after Fred's coming to the Center, and asked me to tell Father Feeney how grateful he and Mrs. Farrell were to have Fred and his sister, Mary, with us. He said that he had felt the need of some such place as the Center during his own days in college, and he was delighted that it had come into being for his son and daughter.

Fred left us for the war years, was commissioned, and spent a year in Japan after the war, working for the Government. He came back to us then, and has been with us ever since. He is one of the many Center people who were not asked to make a profession of their Faith in the newspapers, but who were ready and waiting to make that profession whenever the chance would be given them. He is, in our eyes, along with the other members of the Center, none the less a confessor of his faith in a world grown old and cold, a world at the end of the post-Renaissance, the end of the Reformation, the end of excessive nationalism, and the beginning of we know not what.

And then one day, in the fall of 1942, there came to us, by way of Syria, the American University of Beirut, the University of Michigan and Harvard University,—Fakhri Maluf. He had been having lunch with Father Vincent Flynn, now President of St. Thomas' College in St. Paul, who was doing some research at Harvard. Father Flynn had spoken at the Center one evening, knew its work, and he suggested to Dr. Maluf that he might find the Center of help in many ways. Fakhri came for the first time on a Thursday evening. After Father's lecture he said to me, "Father Feeney is exactly the priest I have been looking for. It is simply amazing."

Fakhri Maluf was born in Syria. His father, an intellectual who taught in a school of his own founding, lost the Catholic Faith for himself and for his children. He died when Fakhri was a boy, and his mother had to take over the running of the school. Fakhri and his brothers and sisters were educated in the family school, and then they all went up to the American University of Beirut. Fakhri received a position on the faculty of the University upon his graduation, and taught physics there for five years. He then came to the University of Michigan, on a scholarship, and received his Master's Degree in 1941, in philosophy. He wrote his doctor's dissertation on the Philosophy of Science, and was given his Ph.D. Degree from Michigan in 1942. He was awarded a fellowship for further study at Harvard University, where he arrived in the fall of 1942.

He had chatted with a Catholic priest on the boat coming to America, and the priest had awakened in him an interest in the Catholic Faith. Fakhri had no idea how he might satisfy his longing to know more about the Faith, but he told himself that if God wanted him to have it He would provide a way. God did provide a way at Michigan, several ways,— in the person of the Catholic chaplain there, of some fellow students who were also interested in philosophy, and in the person of "a very dear friend, Mary Healy (Maluf), an undergraduate student who was a devout Catholic". It was while he was a graduate student at the University of Michigan, that Fakhri Maluf came into the Catholic Church.

Fakhri had an eager enthusiasm for things mental and spiritual, and this he passed on to others. His quiet, gracious manners, his sincerity, his unobtrusive erudition, his pursuit of a way of holiness were so convincing and so refreshing that he won our hearts almost immediately. Such a person was rare in our experience, where the order of the day in college circles was the deliberately cultivated, bored manner of the disciples of Higher Criticism.

Ann Cobb, who came back to us from two years spent in Germany and ran right into the flare of our newspaper publicity, had always sought Fakhri Maluf to explain to her Radcliffe classmates the Catholic philosophy. It was out of one of these discussions that "Dr. Maluf's philosophy night" at St. Benedict Center grew, which in popularity and attendance was second only to Father Feeney on Thursday night. Fakhri suggested to a group of students that they read St. Augustine's *Confessions.* They said they were not sure what they could get out of it, reading on their own, and they asked Dr. Maluf if he would direct them in a study of St. Augustine. This he agreed to do, with the approval of Father Feeney, who said that he would attend the meetings and give his help in the theological and philosophical difficulties, as they arose.

From this beginning grew the Tuesday evening lectures in philosophy and theology which Fakhri Maluf has given at the Center, almost without interruption, from the winter of 1943 until the present day. The list of books studied came to include the *De Anima* and the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, the *City of God* of St. Augustine, the *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine, the *Republic* of Plato, the *Treatise on the Love of God* by St. Bernard, the smaller *Dialogues* of Plato, the *Reduction of the Arts to Theology* by St. Bonaventure, the *Treatise on Habits,* the *Treatise on Man,* the *Treatise on Faith* and *On*

Hope in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, the *Summa Theologica* in general, and many other books of similar nature.

"It is extraordinary how much can be accomplished", Fakhri has said, "in one evening a week dedicated to the classics of philosophy and theology, if it is done with constancy and perseverance over a period of many years!"

He also says of this very successful course of his: "In these Tuesday evening lectures I was both a student and a teacher at the same time. I was learning not merely from the books, but also from Father Feeney, who made it a point to be with us. Whenever we came to a problem or a difficulty which touched the Faith, Father found time to investigate it thoroughly and to give us a full, authoritative solution. You will notice, from the books used, that as time went on our interest in pagan thought was waning, as we became increasingly aware of the wisdom, the holiness, and the unction in the writings of our own Doctors of the Church. Our work became centered in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas. The fact that these Tuesday evenings attracted large numbers of people is a tribute to the fact that serious interest in philosophy and theology are never lacking on the part of men."

And so the Center life went quietly and steadily on during the academic year of 1942-1943. We added a course in the language and the poetry of Dante, which was given by a member of the Romance Language Department of Harvard College. The Catholic faculty and students of Harvard and Radcliffe, and the Chaplain's School at Harvard, had come to take the existence of the Center for granted, and they found it of much use. The Center monthly Communion breakfasts had become popular. Father Feeney would say Mass for us at the Cenacle Convent in Brighton, through the gracious arrangement of Mother Mary Shannon, and after Mass we would come to the Center for breakfast and to listen to a speaker. Father Feeney drew from his own store of friends for our Communion breakfast speakers, and in the course of a year we heard many well-known authors, artists, musicians, of whom Mlle Nadia Boulanger was one.

Toward the middle of the year, Father Thomas Carroll, the chaplain at the Cenacle Convent, began to worry about our absence from our parish churches once a month. He thought it better that we did not use the Cenacle chapel for Mass. Since St. Paul's Church was filled every hour on Sunday mornings for Mass, we tried to get a free time in one of the convent chapels in Cambridge, but were unable to find it. In the end we were obliged to ask Father Feeney if he would inquire of Monsignor Hickey if he could fit us in somehow in St. Paul's.

"I'm sorry," Monsignor Hickey told Father, "there isn't an available time anywhere on Sunday morning, either in the upstairs church or in the basement. They will have to come to one of the large parish Masses and do the best they can."

"They'll be glad to do that, Monsignor", Father said.

"Yes, I will say this for them," Monsignor Hickey told Father Feeney, "they are very docile."

I went home to Hartford for Thanksgiving, with my family. St. Benedict Center became the subject of the dinner conversation. A cousin of ours was present who had, over the years, become well known in newspaper work, and who was now on *The New York Times*. He had spent a great deal of time reporting the labor situation in this country, and he was very much disturbed by the activities of the Communists. He used to say that he thought the *Times* had hired him for his conservative New England background. That same week he had witnessed what was to him the shocking spectacle of New York school teachers out on strike. He suddenly conceived the Center as a bulwark against Communism in the college; in fact, he conceived, on the spot, a Center at every college in America. It was a wonderful idea, and just the thing! He would ask if a man could be sent up from the paper to write the story of St. Benedict Center for the Sunday *Times.*

However, his enthusiasm for St. Benedict's was dashed forever by my first avowal of our later oft-repeated policy, "Thank you, but we don't want any publicity for the Center. It can best do its work quietly."

"For heaven's sake, why?" asked this child of publicity.

I told him the story of the Center's policy about publicity (the reason for which will unfold as this story goes on) but I don't know that I convinced him. He did come to see us, on a Thursday evening, a year or two later. He stayed for Father's lecture. It was our custom, after the lecture, to serve coffee and doughnuts to the students while they stood about, talking for an hour or two. I can still see my reportorial cousin, standing in the middle of the Center floor watching the students, a forbidden story in his eye, as he drawled in his dry way, "My God! If anyone had told me I would come to Cambridge and watch Harvard students listen enthralled to a sermon by a man who could pack them in at Madison Square Garden, and then behold these same students finish the evening off on coffee, I wouldn't have believed it!" He went back and had a word with Father, not as one Catholic to another, for this cousin is still running away from the Church, but as one writer to another, and then he took his solitary way home, to New York.

V

AND so the winter passed. The Center buzzed with life. Father Feeney was obliged to come in from Weston every day, so many were his appointments. Father's converts began to grow. The Paulist Guild in New York asked him to write the story of his conversions, but he found himself too busy instructing to tell the story of it. Under Father's spiritual direction, boys and girls found their life work in religion. Father began to send away to convents and monasteries, to novitiates and seminaries, students chosen by God to carry on His work.

Always we were seeking the best way to do God's work at the Center. Our love for Mary, God's Mother, increased by the day, and while we did our best for Her Son, and real success seemed to crown our efforts, we felt always that there was something we were not doing, something we were not saying. We were able to reach a thousand students a week. We were popular. Boys, away in the Army, wrote us from all over the world. They were writing that the truths which Father Feeney had taught them came home to them even more forcibly when they were away from Father than when they were listening to him at the Center. They thanked him for teaching them to appreciate, besides God and His Mother, the things which God had made, the life He had put upon the earth and in the sea. It kept them from going mad with loneliness. One boy wrote, "Having heard your poem on the mouse, Father, I couldn't even be hard on our scullery mouse."

We had many practical applications of the biblical story of the loaves and fishes. During the winters of 1943 and 1944, we gave once a month, on Sunday, a supper for the men in the Army and Navy schools at Harvard, for the students in the regular Harvard enrollment, and for the girls at Radcliffe College. They became a sort of tradition, these suppers, and we were often at our wit's end planning first how to fit all our guests into our limited space, and second how to procure enough food in those days of rationed portions. Father Feeney liked to go down to the North End of Boston with us, into the Italian section, to shop. Father loved the North End—he loved the Italians. He would walk in the narrow, crowded streets, filled with children, shopping Italian matrons, push carts, fruit stands, clutter and music, and say to us, "I wish to God that we could replace the thing we call culture with this. These people really live. Look at the children!"

The Italians returned his love. They took him for a little Italian priest. He looks very much like one, a Latin carry-over from a grandfather, who was pure Spanish. A friend of mine came to the Center one night to see me, and found she had arrived in the middle of Father's lecture. When she reached me later, she said, "What is Father's name? Feeney? But I didn't think him Celtic, as I watched him speak. I thought him Iberian." Students from South America and Spain, seeing Father for the first time, have thought him Spanish. He, himself, is very proud of his Irish blood. He explains his national likes and dislikes, however, in his magical essay, *Sentiment and Emotion,* in which he concludes,

> "The two nations of Europe that seem to me to be best blended and balanced psychologically are Italy and Spain. The Italians are at root a deeply sentimental people, given to strong emo-

> tional outbursts. The Spaniards are at root a deeply emotional people, given to a strong sentimental restraint. Taken as a whole, the Italians win my affection most easily. Taken as a whole, the Spaniards most compel my admiration. . . . But my debt is to the Irish for my favorite tradition, and to the English for my favorite language."

We always came out of the North End of Boston loaded with food from the Italian push carts, and with love from the Italian hearts.

We would begin, after Mass on the Sunday morning of the supper, to make the Center ready and to cook the meal. We cooked for four hundred students on a three-burner gas stove in the tiny Center kitchen. We kept things hot on an electric grille placed upon the only available table, which was a giddy thing. This grille we plugged into a socket used, ordinarily, to hold the electric bulb which lighted our make-shift telephone booth. To answer the telephone during a Sunday supper was to invite death in the darkness by one of two ways, scalding or electrocution.

The supper which finally ended all suppers for us was one to which well over four hundred students came. The menu was, again, Italian. The supper was prepared for us by the mother of one of the Radcliffe students, who was famous for her Italian dishes. When it was ready, we found it was impossible to serve it in the kitchen because the servers could not get through the crowded halls to the dining room, and so carried the spaghetti in its huge vat to the large table in the main room of the Center. The meat sauce, cooking in an enormous wash-boiler sort of utensil, was brought out and placed beside the spaghetti. Bowls of Italian salad and plates of Italian bread were placed in the middle. Hot coffee and dessert were on tables close by. The students formed lines, beginning outside in the little square, and finally they were able to secure their supper.

It was through this scene that Monsignor John Wright, the Archbishop's secretary and the speaker of the afternoon, made his way to Father Feeney's room.

"It's a fine thing," he said, laughing, "when the guest of honor has to fight seven minutes on the doorstep to gain entry."

We had planned a program after the supper. As we looked out of the window and saw students standing on the sidewalk, eating, Father Feeney said, "We never can fit them all inside, seated. We had better take the chairs out into the janitor's back room, and the students will have to stand. I don't believe too many will care to do that, and so we may get some room for the chairs later on, and we can make people more comfortable."

But they all stayed, and stood, packed side by side. The military uniforms and the girls' dresses, the vigil lights blinking softly before Our Lady's shrine, and the great lighted picture of the Holy Father looking down on his children, made it a memorable sight. Monsignor Wright spoke. He read to us a letter from a French girl he had known in his parish work in France, who wrote now as a heartbroken mother whose maimed baby had been born in the midst of an air raid, and who was not happy under the American occupation of her village.

The Center students put on some skits they had prepared, Father Feeney gave his famous imitations, a musician played the piano for us.

Looking back on it on Monday morning, we were very grateful. It had been a complete success. However, Father Feeney was not satisfied. "Bread and the circuses!" he said. "Horace says that if you feed people and entertain them, they will always come to you. It is true that the food held out miraculously yesterday, it is true we had a good day. But what did we give the students of Our Lord and Our Lady? How much good did we do?"

We could not determine. Monsignor Hickey said of us at this time, "The work is glorious." I met a bank official when I went to the bank in Harvard Square one day, and he said to me, "A high ranking man at Harvard was speaking to me about St. Benedict Center the other day, Mrs. Clarke. He said that he has sent several boys over there, and they couldn't have been better taken care of. He is very much impressed with the work of the Center."

We had a good reputation—that was apparent—and we were gratified and grateful. But we wondered.

VI

ST. BENEDICT CENTER had had for years a personal devotion to Pope Pius XII. Since Father Feeney's coming to us, we had remembered the Holy Father nightly in our prayers. We were especially concerned about him at this time because the Germans were in the air over Rome and the newspapers were speculating as to whether, in the bombing of the city, the Vatican could possibly escape devastation. One of the Center men, Giovanni Bricca, was given an appointment abroad which had to do with the disbursement of American aid to Italy.

"Please, Giovanni," we said to him, "will you see that the Pope is protected?"

He laughed. "Of all the people in Europe at the present time," he said, "the Holy Father seems best able to take care of himself. *He* is protecting the refugees."

It was after this that the Holy Father's blessing, mentioned in the first chapter of this book, reached the Center. It was in the winter of 1945. It had been delayed, we were later told, because they had not been pleased at the Vatican with the first copy which had been made. The illumination of the letters had not quite satisfied them!

The blessing came to us as the result of an audience one of the Center members had had with the Holy Father. Before his audience, our friend had, at the suggestion of someone at the Vatican, written out the story of the Center and sent it in for the Holy Father to read. He had been assured that the account would interest His Holiness. He saw the Pope later, with a group of seven people, all of whom gave to the Holy Father, as is the custom, not their names but the places from which they came. When our friend said he was from Boston, the Holy Father told him, "Ah, yes. And you have a foundation in Cambridge, St. Benedict Center. I have read your account of it, and I send St. Benedict Center my blessing."

That we should be in the mind of His Holiness for even a moment in the midst of his many and solemn cares, touched us deeply. We thanked God for the grace of the blessing of Christ's Vicar. I went across the street to share our news with Monsignor Hickey, and it was in the telling of the Pope's blessing upon the Center work that I suddenly found myself with courage to ask Monsignor something that had been in my mind for a long time. I asked him if he felt he could ask Archbishop Cushing to request of the Jesuit Provincial the official appointment of Father Leonard Feeney to full time work at St. Benedict Center. Father was now living at the Jesuit house which was attached to the Immaculate Conception Church, in the South End of Boston. He was being driven from there for his classes at Weston, and every moment in between those classes, from ten o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night, he was busy in the Center.

"No one appreciates Father Feeney's work at St. Benedict Center more than I do, Mrs. Clarke", Monsignor Hickey told me. "But do you realize what you are asking? You are requesting the Jesuit Order to give you one of its most valuable men, and you have nothing in the way of salary to offer him. I'm sure the Jesuits would not think first of the salary, but they do have young Jesuits to educate, and they have many needs."

"I understand, Monsignor. But, as you know, no one receives a salary at the Center. We feel Our Lady can bless us most when we are poor. We don't have a salary to give Father, but we are sure Our Lady will make it up to the Jesuit Order somehow."

"Well, I will see what I can do", Monsignor told me.

Monsignor Hickey wrote to the Archbishop, and I wrote to the Archbishop's secretary, Monsignor Wright. Archbishop Cushing told us later, when we were all at his house for Confirmation by His Excellency of Father Feeney's converts, that Monsignor Hickey's letter of recommendation had been such a wonderful one that he could do nothing but request the Provincial of the Jesuit Order to give us Father Feeney.

The Very Reverend John J. McEleney, newly appointed Provincial of the Society of Jesus in New England, called Father Feeney into his office. "I was very happy", he told him, "to receive a request from Archbishop Cushing my first day in office, a request which it gave me so much pleasure to fulfill. You are appointed to the work of St. Benedict Center, full time, Father."

Our gratitude knew no bounds. We were very edified. The Jesuits did not mention a salary for Father, or in any way make us feel that we had taken one of their most valuable priests, whose writings and lectures over the country were a source of income for the education of the young members of the Society. We felt that Our Lady was keeping our side of the bargain, however, when, on a Tuesday evening two years later, Father McEleney came over to the Center to listen to Dr. Maluf's course in philosophy, and said, in his tribute to Father Feeney and the Center:

"I am grateful to St. Benedict Center for the unusually fine boys it has sent, through Father Feeney, to the Jesuit Order."

The paternity in the Jesuit Order so impressed us on this occasion that we were totally unprepared for the lack of paternity in the treatment we later received.

And so we entered upon our second five years. The Holy Father's blessing had come to us, and the first fruit of it was Father Feeney's official appointment as full time spiritual director of St. Benedict Center.

The Center was busy, at this time, with a work which was dear to Father. Across the street from the Immaculate Conception Church on Harrison Avenue in Boston, where Father Feeney lived, is the Home for Destitute Catholic Children. Father said the early Sunday morning Mass there during the summer. He had come to be very fond of the children and the nuns who took care of them. He used to listen to the children singing, and one day he said to a group of them,

"Do you like the songs you sing? Do you understand what they are saying?"

"No, Father", they answered.

"Well, you just wait. I'll write some songs especially for you, and a friend of mine will write music for them. I think you'll like our songs."

Father took the text of every song over to the children, and made sure that they both liked and understood it before he issued it in final form. We remember his saying about the song called "Grandma" that you cannot begin "Grandma's old and she doesn't like the cold", because Grandma is short of breath and she never abbreviates because abbreviation is only two shortened words making one long one. And so Grandma would have to say, or rather you would have to say in a song about her which kept the spirit of the frail precision of her words, "Grandma is old and she does not like the cold. She prefers the spring and summer to the fall. And the winter she prefers the least of all." This last is by way of putting in delicate form what would be a violent hate in a younger person.

To be honest, some of the songs had music first, and words second. There were at least two of these, one called "The

Rose" and one called "Moo is a Cow". It is almost unbelievable to think that in the lines of "Moo is a Cow", which are some of the most felicitous Father Feeney has ever written, that they were words written to music already composed. In "Moo is a Cow", Father took all the lovable noises that children hear and identified them with the objects from which they issued, or with which they were associated. It is a daring license, but children are daring in such regard, as Father knew, and they delighted in the audacity that made the sound of a cow be the whole of the beast, from horns to tail. "Moo is a Cow" is haunting, with or without music, inside the barn or out in the field. This is the way it runs, in terms of its own music:

MOO IS A COW

Moo is a cow
When she makes a bow
To a meadow-full of hay;
Shoo is a hen
When she's back again
And you want her to go away;
Peek-a-boo
Is maybe I don't see you,
But I'm sure you can't see me;
Splash is a stone
When a big one's thrown
In a river or lake or sea.
Snap is a twig,
Grunt is a pig,
Baa is the tune of a sheep;
There's a melody hid
In the katy-did,
And the cricket that likes to peep.

Hush is your lip
When your finger-tip
Says you shouldn't make a sound;

Hop is a toad
Right across the road,
Without stopping to look around;
Pit-a-pat is rain
On the window-pane;
Buzz-a-buzz a busy bee;
Creak is a stair,
When you ask "Who's there?"
And there's no one to say "It's me".
Tick is a clock,
Click is a lock
After you've closed the door;
And a soft tiptoe
Is to let you know
You have fallen asleep once more.

Bounce is a ball
Up against a wall,
When you've given it a throw.
Rip is a tear
In a thing you wear,
That your mother will want to sew;
Rub-a-dub-dub-dub
Is a drummer-boy,
When a band goes marching by;
Twinkle's a bright
Little star at night,
Or a funny look in your eye.
Ouch is a pain,
Toot is a train,
Sneeze is perhaps a cold;
And a My, oh my
Is: I wonder why
You will never do what you're told.

The children liked "Moo is a Cow" by way of zoology and cosmology. Here is how Father wrote them a musical history lesson:

ONCE UPON A TIME *

Once upon a time,
Mary went to call the cattle home;
Once upon a time,
Nero played a fiddle while they burned down Rome;
Once upon a time,
Noah built the ark when it started to rain,—
Launcelot loved Elaine,
Christopher Columbus grew tired of Spain,—
Once upon a time.

Once upon a time,
The dish ran away with the spoon;—
Once upon a time,
The butterfly came from the cocoon,
Once upon a time.
There wasn't any you and there wasn't any I,
But Washington never told a lie,
And four and twenty blackbirds were baked in a pie,
Once upon a time.

Once upon a time,—
A turtle beat a rabbit in a race,
Once upon a time;—
Everything remarkable always took place
Once upon a time;—
Someone wrote a song about an old gray mare,
Simple Simon met a pieman going to a Fair;
Isn't it unfortunate we couldn't have been there?
Once upon a time.

The outcome of all this was told in the Boston newspapers in May, 1945. In the DRAMA column of the Boston *Record* for Monday, May 5, 1945, there appeared the following story by Mr. Leo Gaffney:

---

* "Moo Is a Cow" and "Once Upon a Time" are reprinted here with permission of G. Schirmer, Inc., New York.

Unique is the word for "The Children", song cycle by Leonard Feeney and Theodore Chanler, presented on three successive Sunday afternoons at the Hotel Commander ballroom in Cambridge. (Final performance of the series next Sunday.)

It is unique because it is probably the first time since "Walter, Walter Wild Flower" that the adult mind has set down in song and story the true heart and mind of a child—in terms of the child rather than in the smarty-smarty way of, say, the public evidences of the Quiz Kids.

Leonard Feeney, who is as much distinguished as a Jesuit priest as he is as a poet, has a genius for simple, perfect, effortless rhyming. Specimen: "Wind is the air in your hair when you stand on the sand." And his rare perception of the chaste beauty of the child-soul together with his humorous understanding of its bodily wriggles permit him to express "The Children" with unexampled skill and, at times, overpowering beauty.

Too, it is with Father Feeney a high development of the pastoral love of all the young. This is the devotion that earns for the priest the title, Father.

. . . It is not 'easy' music to impart either to the child or to the adult, yet it is remarkable how easily the 30 odd tots from The Home for Destitute Catholic Children (who take part) grasp the tricky modulations and subtle changes of musical pace bound up with this eventful, lively and charming contribution to the art of song.

Father Feeney has provided also a series of adroit sketches, eloquently enacted by grown up students of St. Benedict's Center, that range in variety and humor from a travesty on a Vermont undertaker toying with a new 'deep freeze' method to the Magnificat of the Blessed Mother.

Most effective of the sketch players are David Supple and Mary Maluf.

The commercial theatre will probable take little note of "The Children", though in its desperate frenzy to be clever it would do well to borrow from the freshness of Feeney and Chanler.

It is a temptation to linger with the telling of the story of "The Children", so exquisite a memory is it. All five performances were packed. Great numbers of priests attended, which delighted Father, and nearly all of Boston's distinguished composers, who were interested in Mr. Chanler. A well-known music publisher was in the audience for the last performance. He was enthusiastic about the songs.

"The words are perennial", he told me. "They have that ineffable, human quality, so simple and yet so hard to attain —the same thing that has made 'Silent Night' live for centuries."

Mr. Boland, the owner of the Hotel Commander, gave the ball-room to Father Feeney for the last afternoon, for the project dearest to Father's heart. This was the showing of his play to the nuns, the patient, unsung teachers of little children. Father had written for the American sisters all through his years. He understood nuns, reverenced and loved them, and he had passed this reverence on to us, at the Center. Nuns, all over America, had taught their school children his poems. One of his hardest blows, apart from the blow to the sacrament of his priesthood and to his parents, which Father has received as a result of the calumny and persecution to which he has been subjected for this last year and a half, is the silencing of his poems in the Catholic grammar schools of the country.

Father was very happy on the afternoon when the sisters from the schools on the Cambridge side of the Charles River came to the Hotel Commander and watched the performance in "The Children" of forty little girls, and twenty big girls and boys, under his direction and the direction of Sister Louise, the beautiful Sister of Charity at the Home for Destitute Catholic Children who had charge of music for the children. Mr. Boland said of Sister Louise that she did more good just by walking through the lobby of the hotel than a thousand sermons could do.

The number of adult (and infant) baptisms, marriages, and vocations at the Center had by this time become remarkable, and they were the work of one priest, Father Feeney. We have a list of them all. We used to say that Our Lady seemed to send us things in cycles. For several weeks, there seemed to be nothing but engagements. One by one, or two by two, boys and girls would go to see Father in his room, from which they would emerge, Father holding a hand of each, and the new engagement would be announced to the expectant Center, who scarcely ever failed to say, "We knew it right along." One night a Harvard Navy student rushed in, and coming upon Father in the middle of the room, he blurted hurriedly, "Father, will you bless this ring, please? I'm catching the train to see my girl in half an hour. She lives in Pittsburgh!"

"Of course," said Father, taking the ring, "but have I met you before?"

"No, Father", the boy answered. "I haven't had time to come over. They work us hard, you know. But my friends told me that when you bless engagements, they stick. Thanks a lot, Father. I'll bring her to see you when she comes up. Good-bye."

Then for another while we seemed to have nothing but vocations. And then nothing but marriages. All the Center babies seemed to come at once, and we were every other day standing outside the baby room of a hospital, while Father blessed the newest Center baby through the window.

One Thursday afternoon, at dusk, walking up to Harvard Square, I caught sight of the headlines in the evening newspapers. ATOMIC BOMB DROPPED ON JAPAN! I read about it and could not go on. I returned to St. Benedict Center, and told them that hundreds of thousands of women, children, and old men had been killed or injured by something called an atom bomb which had been dropped on a teeming Japanese city from an American airplane.

That evening, after Father's lecture, St. Benedict Center stated that it was deeply grieved by the news of the atom bombing in the evening papers. We could not find it in our hearts to rejoice over the wholesale slaughter of innocent people. We had, months before this, been obliged to disagree with the officers who were in the Army Occupation courses, who had come into the Center and had told us that it was part of their teaching that the Japanese were sub-human. We were at a loss to understand what a "sub-human" being could possibly be, since all men were possessed of spiritual souls, and the Japanese were admittedly men. This "sub-human" theory seemed very much like the old attacks on the nature of man, against which the Council of Vienne pronounced, in 1311, when it condemned as erroneous any teaching which denied that the rational soul was by itself and by its nature the form of the body.*

The atomic bombing of Japan, to our thinking, was un-Christian. The discussion which followed this announcement lasted a long time. The military personnel who were present explained the possible technical reasons for the dropping of the bomb. We reiterated our ethical and Catholic indignation. Actually, we said, we were fearful for Western civilization.

---

* Mourret-Thompson, History of the Catholic Church, Vol. 5: "By 'form' in this connection is meant the principle of activity which differentiates beings and which, by penetrating them with its power, gives them the properties that distinguish them. In the present case, it is the rational soul that penetrates the body with its force and power, thereby giving it its 'human' properties, which distinguish it from plants and animals. The condemnation of the Council of Vienne seems, however, to go farther and to include any doctrine which, while recognizing in each man an individual rational soul, would place outside of it the 'form,' i.e., the principle of human life."

Part 2

STORM SIGNALS

VII

WE WERE never quite the same, at St. Benedict Center, after the dropping of the atom bomb. It seemed to have shocked us awake. It was almost as if we saw the life around us for the first time. The scales fell from our eyes, and we beheld clearly as actualities many things which we had dreaded might one day be the outcome of our exclusively humanitarian society.

There was worried talk about the revival of Communism. We had never been happy about America's alliance with Russia during the war, and we were unpopular, often, for saying so. However, we felt that Communism, like Nazism and Fascism, had within it the elements of its own destruction. We were most disturbed about the silence of the Church at this time. Surely now the Church should be giving the challenge of Christ to the ailing world. Surely it should be shouting from the housetops for men to halt in their pagan plunge to destruction. Was there nowhere the voice of a St. Paul, or a St. Augustine, a St. John the Baptist who would bellow in all the land?

We waited and we listened, but no strong voice arose above the noise of the world. There was only the jubilant announcing of a new age, the atomic age, born out of the abandonment of a Christian principle!

In the end, of course, we were forced to ask ourselves what *we* were doing about it all. We were able to stifle the question for a while with the excuse that it really wasn't our place to do anything about it. It was the Hierarchy's place. We were doing our own job rather well. Everyone seemed to think so, as far as we could tell. Archbishop Cushing, at a recent Confirmation of Father's converts in His Excellency's little chapel at Archbishop's House, had spoken in highest praise of the Center work. However, we were not able for more than a short time to still the steady insistence of our consciences, for we knew it was the duty of everyone who clearly saw the situation to do something about it.

One day news came that the war was ended, and the boys were coming home. Hundreds of Center boys, still in uniform, stopped to see us on their way to their homes. Many said that they were coming back, to go to school again. They, and many others, did return for the beginning of the next academic year. Harvard, like every college in the country, was literally swamped by an enrollment of men, under the GI Bill of Rights, which filled every classroom to its capacity and taxed the housing facilities for miles around Cambridge.

They jammed St. Benedict Center, too. There was in these boys something that had not been in the pre-war students. They were older, wiser. They had been disciplined by the war. They had looked on death. They were eager for all we had to give them, eager for life, these students who had faced the giving up of life. They were hungry for truth, the veterans we met at the Center. They settled down to study at Harvard, and they came to us every possible moment in between their work.

These men completed the change in St. Benedict Center's policy. Father saw the eagerness go out of their faces after they had been going to school a few months. It was not the normal fading of enthusiasm which so often accompanies the realization of that to which one has long looked forward. It was eagerness replaced by a surprised disillusionment. At the Government's expense and their own time, they told us, they were being taught, by professor after professor, the very doctrines which had brought on the war they had just been fighting. Many of these professors had been lecturing, safe in their classrooms, all through the war. The students had not gone to battle, so they told us, to rid the world of Military Nazism only to return to college to be taught to base their thinking on Nazi ideology, in the philosophy of Hegel, the psychology of Freud, the sociology of Karl Marx. If these thinkers and their numerous progeny were telling the truth, all right; but it had taken a global war to prove that their fruits were the fruits of error, and not of truth.

On the one hand, in various classes, students were told that God did not exist; man could know nothing outside his mind; the very fact of his existence was doubtful; religion was something devised for the control of the masses; there was no such thing as an immortal soul (much less a heaven to go to after death). On the other hand, they were told that man's mind was God. In a few years, man would have discovered the secret hidden in the universe from the dawn of evolution, and he could create and destroy at will!

The concept of God had no meaning in physics, the students came to find out, because it was impossible to verify the concept or to experiment upon it. It was impossible to examine God, or to investigate Him. And so, therefore, the concept of God was to be disregarded in physics. One of our students was given to understand that he could be a good geomorphologist, but in order to do it he would have to make geomorphology his religion.

Graduate students in science came to Father for help. They were shaken by the magnitude of the horror that could come upon the world from their own work, and by what seemed to be a complete lack of moral responsibility on the part of their teachers. Indeed, moral standards seemed completely to be breaking down everywhere. A student said to Father Feeney one day, "I wouldn't give to you or to anyone else authority to set up a system of right and wrong. Anything is right to do if a man thinks it is."

"Is that so?" asked Father. "Well, let's see. How would you feel about murder, for instance? Would you hold it was right for a man to murder his mother?"

"Well, I wouldn't murder my mother myself. But if somebody else murdered his mother, I would hold it was the right thing to do if he believed it was."

"What if it was your brother who murdered his mother?" Father asked. The student made no answer.

As the year wore on, more and more reports reached us of students losing their faith, of students committing suicide. A proctor brought to Father one night three students, each of whom had been contemplating suicide for some time. Father did his best to talk them out of it.

One morning Father found two war veterans waiting for him. They were unhappy. "We were just thinking, Father," they said, "of where we would send our children to school, if we had any. We wouldn't send them to any school we know, Catholic or non-Catholic."

"What's the matter with the Catholic schools?" Father asked them.

"You tell us, Father", they answered. "We've just been talking to a fellow who's left the Church. He and four others. Five of them. And they all come from that Catholic preparatory school in Portsmouth, Rhode Island."

"Nothing adds up", the boys said.

The situation added up for us, however, and it made the sum of our duty clear. *Someone* had to tell the truth before it was too late. The full, unequivocal, uncompromised message of Jesus Christ had to be thundered in the world again. It could not merely be told. It had to be shouted, bellowed, because the world was deaf, asleep, already half-dead. Polite talking would not wake it, nor would vague reference, large gesture, platitudinous utterance. "Never give offense" seemed to be the Catholic policy of the day. We knew that it was impossible to tell the truth, and not give offense. Christ had given offense to the Pharisees of His day, and to the Saducees (the free-thinkers of His time) , who robbed Jewish children of their full birthright of revealed doctrine.

We knew full well what had happened to Jesus for telling His eternal truth. He was lied about, called crazy. They strove to drive Him out; they crucified Him between two thieves. They would have no part of Him. But He told the Truth, nevertheless, even though it embarrassed men in high places. Was the servant above the Master—should he ask for any more than the Master had received?

We went into a more intensive study of the Scriptures. We studied the Church Fathers, and the Doctors of the Church. We studied the Scriptures in Greek and Latin because we wanted to know exactly what Jesus had said and how He had said it, for our own knowledge and sanctification and so that we might be better able to tell His truth to His people.

We would give the full Catholic message by every means God had given us in the Center. Father Feeney would tell it on Thursday night. We would study it in our courses; we would write it.

We would *write* it—we would bring out a magazine, and we would call it, this magazine which would have to borrow from the saints and doctors their thunder, this magazine which we hoped would go roaring into the highways and the byways, which would shout the truth, we would call it FROM THE HOUSETOPS.

The first issue of FROM THE HOUSETOPS came out in September 1946. It was very well received. Monsignor Hickey called upon us to tell us how much he liked it. Monsignor Wright said that His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing (to whom we had gone when we first conceived the idea of the magazine, for his approval and blessing) would be glad to contribute some articles for it. In the December 1946 issue, Archbishop Cushing had an article in the HOUSETOPS entitled, "Catholics and Communism". In the March 1947 issue, His Excellency wrote on "The Catholic Chaplains". In 1947 also, someone in the Vatican wrote a letter in praise of FROM THE HOUSETOPS.

The circulation of our magazine resembled very much the representation of people in the Center. Subscriptions came from countries in Europe, from India, the Near East, the Far East, South America, Canada, most of the states of the United States, the Philippines. College libraries subscribed to it. Priests contributed to it; nuns wrote for it. We came to have a group of distinguished writers, as well as a list of distinguished readers.

As our message grew clearer, and our voice stronger, the general praise of us grew more wary. We were startling the Liberals, who had expected that under Father's direction the HOUSETOPS would take on the charming humor, the delightful wisdom, the joyous entertainment of his own earlier books.

We have been asked many times what we mean by a "Liberal". It is evident we do not mean a Liberal in the political sense, but in the religious sense, and as pertaining to the Catholic religion, inasmuch as religion in the abstract has no meaning to a Catholic. A Catholic Liberal is one who, having taken all his cultural standards from a non-Catholic society, tries to make his Catholic dogmas square with these standards. Liberal Catholicism can occur in any country because it is a relative thing. Our battle with it is particularly as it has occurred in the United States, where non-Catholicism anteceded the advent, in large numbers, of Catholics. This situation induced Catholics to attempt to reconcile beliefs they had brought over from Europe with the humanitarian, utilitarian, pragmatic and political ideals of the new world into which they now moved. As a result, Catholics stopped being interested in Christ, and started being interested in Christianity. This term Christianity quickly became hyphenated with the various secular group movements, and it ended up by leaving Catholics with a set of relative standards as regards religion, and caused them to abandon, little by little, their dogmatic certitudes.

The Liberal Catholic, it may be said, is one who always knows how God *should* behave. God's behaviour is invariably made to conform with the Liberal's own fine feelings in any situation. Father Feeney once said, "A Catholic Liberal tries to make the Jesus described in Holy Scripture square with his own preconceived notion of how an incarnate God should talk and behave. He wants to seek first the mercy of God, and expects that His justice will be added to it."

A Liberal Catholic does not like the statement "No Salvation Outside the Church", because "it isn't nice". One of his favorite expressions is, "My dear grandfather was not a Catholic, but he was a good man in every way."

Father Feeney had come to know Catholic Liberalism in England and in America, in his work at Oxford, and in New York, where he was an associate editor of *America,* the Jesuit weekly. He had come to be aware of it with that sixth sense which is the poet's, that keenness of perception which is denied those who are not poets, and which is the cause of much suffering for the possessor of it because he must wait until his more unseeing brothers catch up with him. A poet, like a prophet, is never without honor save in his own country.

Father had long seen where liberalism in Catholicism was going to lead us. In 1935, almost innocently in the midst of what was supposed to be his lighter verse, we find issuing from the pen of the so-called "whimsical Leonard Feeney" a poem as stark and challenging as any poet of modern times has uttered. The fact that it went unnoticed was not Father

Feeney's fault, for he was realistic enough to call it by the name it deserved. Its title was "The Hound of Hell":

Pray for the fragile daughter,
And the frail, infant son,
Whom, at the font, the baptismal water
I pour upon.

The cycle has swung to sorrow,
Our ranks have begun to fail;
We know not what gate of Hell tomorrow
Will not prevail.

The foam-at-the-mouth is frothing
In the Beast with the flashing tooth;
The Hound that was sent on the scent of Nothing,
Has found the Truth.

The guns will be hard to handle
In the forts we will soon forsake.
Pray for the light of the single candle
On the birthday cake.

Father Feeney had despaired of doing anything about Catholic Liberalism until he was at the Center for several years. When so much came clear to us about the state of a world which would permit the dropping of the atom bomb on Japan; when the boys came back to study and found in every class, practically, the same philosophy which had brought on the war; when we came to the realization that we must speak out no matter who was hurt or whose sense of expediency was outraged,—Father knew we at last saw the problem. And when Father had, finally, strong and holy men and girls (become so under his direction) who were as eager as he was to work for the Truth, then he knew that something could be done about it.

He changed, then, from the "poet priest" his admirers had known. (Father used to say that this title gave one the impression of a poet who did a little priesting on the side.) He changed from the priest who had been lionized in literary circles in many cities, who had been in demand as a dinner speaker, a lecturer, a famous humorist, who had delighted all and challenged none. He became instead the thundering, fighting missionary who, warring in the name of the Wonderful Mediatrix of all Graces, God's Mother, filled students with a love for God which sent them into all the churches around for daily Mass, which led them to spend their spare time studying the Scriptures and the Doctors, which fired them to make sacrifices so heroic that they left homes, parents, prestiges,—to face disgrace, ignominy and persecution.

It was not until the second year, however, that the shouting FROM THE HOUSETOPS really pierced the ears of the Liberals. One article, principally, caught their attention. It was in Volume II, No. 1, the September, 1947, issue of the HOUSETOPS. It was called "Sentimental Theology", and was written by Fakhri Maluf.

After the publication of that article, we were able to discern, far out, signs of a gathering storm. However, we were too busy trying to get to the bottom of Liberalism to regard these signs as ominous. We had come to know that our work of the moment, namely, the charting of clear values to replace the shattered certitudes of the students, was work on the periphery only. There was, somewhere, a serious disarrangement of truth, and we knew that if we prayed hard enough, groped long enough, worked steadily enough we would find the doctrine, the displacement of which had made Catholic Liberalism possible.

VIII

DURING the academic year 1946-47, under our new policy of fearlessly telling the truth, the number of Father Feeney's converts increased. Many non-Catholics liked what Father was saying. It was what they had been looking for, the truth spoken as by one having authority. Our trouble has come not so much from non-Catholics, as from Catholics. The American Catholic is a sort of diluted Catholic, made so by force of circumstance, and the Boston Catholic is a sort of Catholic all by himself.

Some very brilliant and bright Irish were brought over to America, because persecution made it impossible for them to make a living in their own country. The auspices, however, under which their priests began to function in Boston was more of a church-building, housing problem than it was of ardent plans for the spreading of the Faith. The regime was holy and God-fearing. The Italian Apostolic Delegate who said, "The Irish do not love God; they fear Him", was being, as anyone can see, more racial than religious. But those of us who have Irish blood in our veins might well wonder if he was not hitting a little too close to the truth for our comfort.

The Irish, and may I say particularly in Boston, were a warm, generous and loving people. The formality and restraint of their religion came from having merely good men and not saints as priests. Their settling among the Puritans of Boston did not help either, for Puritanism and Jansenism have too much in common. There was a wide streak of Jansenism in the Irish priest. Irish theology and Plymouth Rock manners are one of the weirdest and most difficult-to-live-under regimes this world has ever experienced. This strained combination is responsible for such slogans as *Beacon Street bluestockings, Banned in Boston,* and *His preeminent Eminence,* William Cardinal O'Connell.

Some of Father's finest men came to him during the years 1946-47 and 1947-48, men of remarkable depth of faith and of courage. They are with us now, and have been, all through our trials. Father Feeney and I have spent the greater part of our lives in academic circles, and it is our measured judgment that the Center men are some of the most brilliant minds we have ever known. They are today more fully convinced than ever that we should keep on telling, no matter what befalls us as a result of it, the full truth, which is at once the protection of the Church and the safeguard of Her children.

The Center courses, during these academic years, doubled. The evening lectures were so filled that we had to turn people away, sometimes as many as two hundred at a time. Father Fitzpatrick, of St. Paul's, and I went over the Center, vainly trying to make more room in order to accommodate those who wished to come to us.

Our vocations also increased, as did our engagements and marriages. Father brought students, and even older people, for baptism to St. Paul's Church, to Boston College, to other parishes in the diocese. Every so often, we would fill Archbishop Cushing's chapel, for Confirmation. And for the great occasion of their First Holy Communion, we were given permission to bring Father's converts to the reverent quiet of Carmel, to the Sacred Heart Convent, to the Cenacle; or to Father's own chapel in the Jesuit House on Harrison Avenue, and later to St. Andrew House, on Newbury Street, in Boston.

Monsignor John Wright was our frequent guest at this time. He seemed to enjoy dropping in during the evening, to listen to Father's stories and the students' skits. Father Feeney had a genius for bringing out in the students whatever talent they had, and often many people preferred not to go to the theatre or the movies on Friday and Saturday evenings; it was more fun at the Center on "Father's amateur hour".

Father, himself, had a most remarkable ability for mimicry. When he mimicked a person, it was a complete portrayal in voice, gesture, and form, precisely because Father never let the one he was imitating talk on a subject usual to him. It was one of Father's theories that you can study form and style in an orator much better when you have him speaking on some subject alien to his ordinary interests.

Father would write and deliver a fireside chat of President Roosevelt talking, not on the state of the Government in Washington, but on the state of the Catholic Church in America. Father could imitate Miss Katherine Hepburn, broadcasting a prize-fight. He could give Governor Al Smith delivering a lecture on Scholastic Philosophy. He also could give a Sunday evening broadcast of Monsignor Fulton Sheen, on the subject of Coca-Cola.

Monsignor Wright enjoyed immensely all of Father's imitations, with, possibly, the exception of the one on Monsignor Sheen. Father knew this, and so did we. Was it because Monsignor Wright saw the danger in the parody that might occur on his own style of talking in case Father chose to add him to his repertory? We think so, and events have proved it. Father Feeney always restrained himself on the subject of Monsignor Wright, partly through respect, and partly through affection. It is only fair to say that later, when Monsignor Wright had been appointed Auxiliary Bishop of Boston, and had called in the Boston newspaper reporters at eleven o'clock one night, so as to have Father Feeney "silenced" on the front pages of the morning papers, with no chance to make a statement in his own defense, that Father Feeney got around to giving us the long delayed imitation of Bishop Wright.

This imitation was different from the others. Father did not need to mimic Bishop Wright talking on a subject Father had chosen for him. He needed merely to rehearse, with the precise skill at mimicry for which he is famous, the usual address Bishop Wright gave to a Catholic audience, on the subject of Cosmic Catholicity, or "The Faith of the Future in Not-Yet Established Dioceses of the Church".

Father Feeney's strong message at this time, therefore, won to us students not only from the undergraduate colleges, but also from the Law, Business and Medical Schools. James R. Walsh and Charles Ewaskio, who with Fakhri Maluf and David Supple featured in the Boston Heresy Case, also came to us in these years.

Fakhri Maluf had resigned from Holy Cross College as the war drew to a close, in 1945. On Father Feeney's recommendation, he was appointed to teach mathematics and philosophy at Boston College, the local Jesuit college. He was also appointed to teach philosophy at the Adult Education Institute of Boston College, "Intown". His course at the Adult Education Institute was, through the years he taught there, very popular, and it was to one of these classes that James R. Walsh, still in Naval uniform, came one evening. He showed unusual interest in the class discussion, and asked some excellent questions. He returned later as a regular student, and after his release from the Navy, on the advice of Dr. Maluf he registered for graduate work in philosophy at Boston College. He had received his Bachelor's Degree from Bates College, and before the war had taught mathematics for a year or two. When James Walsh had been at Boston College for a short time, he was offered an instructorship in mathematics, which he carried along with his graduate studies in philosophy.

Charles Ewaskio was one of Father Feeney's converts. He was at this time doing research work in the Department of Physics at Harvard, having received his B.S. from Connecticut State College, his M.S. from Harvard (in physics), and having done special research in physics at Johns Hopkins and Harvard.

Father Feeney used to say that the tragedy of conversions to the Faith was that after the catechumen had finished instruction and had received the sacraments, he had no Catholic culture into which to return with his Faith. He was obliged to go back into our secularized society, where it was impossible to tell a Catholic from a non-Catholic. There used to be a time when this was not so, when becoming a Catholic meant a conversion in a total sense. This is no longer true in the United States, due, in no small part, to the secularization of our ecclesiastics, themselves.

Charles Ewaskio felt keenly the secularization of religion in the outside world. His conversion was whole and complete, and he was distressed by the lack of religious belief in the department in which he was working. He wanted, in order to grow in the Faith, to work somehow in the atmosphere of the Faith, to be with people with whom he could discuss it. He brought his troubles to Father, who told him that he admired his integrity very much, and that he thought Charlie could get what he wanted. He might, however, have to make somewhat of a sacrifice to accomplish it. He asked him how he would like to work in a Catholic college. His salary wouldn't be as much as his present job paid him, nor would he have as much prestige. But he would be teaching in the same building with the Blessed Sacrament, there would be a crucifix above his desk, he would have priests for his colleagues.

And so Charles Ewaskio applied for a position as teacher of physics at Boston College, and was accepted. He and his wife and baby daughter left the convenient and attractive apartment which they had in a quiet university street in Cambridge, and moved to the only rent within their now limited means, one of the typical, poor houses in the streets just below the Harvard College dormitories and St. Paul's Church.

Seven months later Charles Ewaskio was fired from that Catholic college to which, for spiritual reasons, he had wanted to go, at the sacrifice of so much earthly comfort. He was fired for holding that there is no salvation outside that Church into whose infallible arms he had run so short a time before from the uncertainty, doubt and despair which had all but torn him to pieces outside it, and had wracked him as he lay in a hospital worn with disease, after the war.

And that brings me to a great mistake which we made at this time, and to one of the most surprising and hard lessons we had to learn.

IX

OUR mistake at this time lay in our misconception of conditions in Catholic colleges. We thought them much better than they were, and it took us two years to learn how heavy were the inroads which Liberalism had made into Catholic education.

At St. Benedict Center, Father Feeney preached against the evils in post-war secular education, of which we had ample evidence in the colleges around us. The students to whom Father spoke were well aware of the truth of what he was saying; indeed they had complained to him many times of their dissatisfaction and disappointment with their courses. As time wore on, many of them decided for themselves that there followed upon the realization of evils the obligation of correcting them. It would have been far easier to shake their heads over the situation, as hundreds did, and go on enjoying the prestiges and benefits of membership in famous colleges. They could have rationalized that the whole situation was so large that it was impossible for any one person or any small group to do anything about it.

Resignation from Harvard or Radcliffe entailed so much courage (and sacrifice of a certain kind) on the part of a student, that Father Feeney never would direct a man or a girl to do it. He could but state the inadequacies and errors in the education they were receiving, and leave it up to them to do whatever, in conscience, they felt should be done about it. As student after student made the decision to resign from college—giving frankly in his resignation to the college his reasons for doing so—Father was tremendously proud of them. He was grateful that something as beautiful as this could happen in our land, which seemed completely to be given over to the quest of wealth, power, or worldly prestige, with no thought of God or of what was owed to Him.

With each resignation, however, there came the question of another college for the student. The Center curriculum did not offer pre-medical work or concentrated courses in science. Around this time, we made up a "Statement of Aims" of the St. Benedict Center School, which will perhaps best explain the nature of our own school and why it would not, in all cases, fit the needs of students who desired to make science their profession. However, I should say that we have always maintained that if a man could spend the time for a liberal education in the full sense of the term, and then go on to science (if he wished to make that his life work), he would bring to his field a judgment and wisdom which would make him a more excellent scientist. There follows the "Statement of Aims" of St. Benedict Center School as it appeared in our catalogue:

> St. Benedict Center at the present time is deliberately a small school. Its faculty, however, is an eminent one, and its library excellent. Its aim is to give a thorough education in Liberal Arts, modelled on the classic traditions of the best universities in Europe, at which its faculty, with the exception of three or four, have studied.
>
> St. Benedict Center is interested in close cooperation between faculty and students, and for that purpose the teachers mutually attend each other's classes, and are at the call of the students for special instruction or query at almost any time of the school day. The teachers thereby see exactly what in-

> struction is being given the student in every subject, and this contributes enormously to that most difficult of all educational problems, personal guidance.
>
> . . . St. Benedict Center is qualified to offer academic work leading to B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees. Its work is mainly in the field of special research in the classics.

The students who resigned from Harvard and Radcliffe were anxious to make their secular studies in the light of their Faith, and so we advised one or other Catholic college for them, without hesitation. We had been placing advanced Center students on the faculties of Catholic colleges, where they had been well received. Father Keleher, the President of Boston College, later told Father Feeney that he was grateful for the caliber of the students Father had sent to Boston College, both to the undergraduate and graduate schools.

We were completely unprepared, therefore, for the return of these students who transferred to Catholic colleges, bearing the same tale of disappointment and dissatisfaction we had heard from them before. They had found not too much difference between the college they had left and the college to which they had transferred. For both colleges were similar in aim and in outlook, in presentation of material and in subject matter. The Catholic college, it is true, did not utter such explicit apostasy. Its apostasy was more implicit, and took the form of a wholesale aping of secular standards.

The Catholic colleges did not say outright that man is in the world for the achieving of his own ends, that he is the alpha and the omega of all things. They did not say, as the teachers in secular colleges, that man's eternal destiny is only an idea that some theologians and philosophers like to play with; that it is the notion which made for the backwardness of the Dark Ages and the superstition of the Middle Ages; that it is, in fact, the reason why Catholic countries today are without modern improvements, such as bathtubs and showers! But the courses in the Catholic colleges were, nevertheless, completely secularized. The religion course was in a compartment all by itself, and its presentation was dull and mediocre, without fire, and it communicated its message not at all to the other courses in the curriculum. These courses seemed to be set up only with an eye to making the student, later on, a rich man or a power in some field where his scientific prestige or political aggrandizement would redound to the glory of the college. Even a mediocre student could, for the most part, be assured of a good job upon graduation. And every student could be sure that he would look like and be like every other college graduate of every other college in America, whether Catholic or non-Catholic. That he was totally unaware that his Faith was the most exciting thing in the world, and that the full living of it would change the world, seemed not to matter to anyone.

Christ had said, "I have come to cast fire upon the earth, and what will I but that it be kindled?" Father Feeney had kindled such a fire at St. Benedict Center. If our students who transferred to Catholic colleges had not had the experience of secular colleges beforehand, and if they had not gone out from the flame which is Father Feeney, they would not have been so thoroughly chilled and disillusioned by the Catholic colleges.

We had no need to ask ourselves for long how this state of things had come to pass in Catholic education. The answer was right before our eyes, across the street in Harvard Yard. Twenty-four Jesuit priests were studying that year at Harvard. (Other Orders, thanks to this encouragement, were beginning to send members, too. Even the archdiocese of Boston sent its Superintendent of Schools to be prepared in the Harvard Department of Education, and nuns were seen all during the summer in the walks of Harvard College.) The Greeks had a saying, "Send your son to school to a slave, and he will become a slave." We might add, "Send your priests and nuns to secular schools, and they will become secular teachers—in Catholic colleges."

The Harvard Jesuits were the classmates of Harvard and Radcliffe students who came regularly for the St. Benedict Center courses, and the presence of the priests in many of the students' classes was a constant confusion and disedification to them. Our students often saw the priests sit, apparently unmoved, in the classes of atheists and Marxist sympathizers. The priests listened while these professors frequently denied Christ, questioned His claims, belittled Him, or cast reflections on devotions to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. Through it all, the priests remained, if not smiling and serene, at least without open protest and complaint, the kind that any true priest is required to give under circumstances such as these. The Harvard Jesuits were always on most cordial terms with the professors, and often called them by their first names. They seemed to be interested in everything except what was happening to Catholic dogmas in the courses which they attended.

Father Feeney, after most bitter experience, forbade the Harvard Jesuits to come to St. Benedict Center. He did so because they were consistently undoing the work the Center was trying to do, and this the students openly admitted. There then began against Father Feeney a crusade of persecution on the part of the Harvard Jesuits which is almost beyond mention. The Jesuit superiors knew about this, but never, so far as we knew, was anything done to censure the Harvard Jesuits.

The academic prestige of a college, it is true, comes in great part from the advanced degrees held by its faculty, and it is true also that it was for the purpose of obtaining academic recognition in this way that priests and nuns went, in the beginning, to secular colleges. However, to take the example of the Jesuits, by the time a member of the Society of Jesus is ready for graduate work at a secular college he has had from fourteen to sixteen years of academic work, an amazingly long period of study. One of the deans of Harvard College, whose field of study was history, once said to Father Feeney, "What have we got to teach your men in history? I tried to tell that to one of your priests who came to me last week. 'Why are you here?', I asked him. 'We don't have any more to give you.' "

The Jesuits hold that the end does not justify the means. None of the secular colleges have knowledges according to the pattern which a priest should be teaching. Everybody knows and can see that harm comes to the Faith of the priests in these universities. This is one of the most common subjects of conversation among the students. If it were true that the Jesuits did not know this, it would be a scandal. The Jesuits *do* know this, and many of their members have violently protested against it, but the powers in control of the Jesuit Order at the present moment are the minority which favors this procedure.

They are such Jesuits as Father Jean Baptiste Janssens, S.J., a liberal Belgian Jesuit, responsible for the type of scholarship that the Bollandists are famous for; responsible also for the type of scholarship which induced Father de Letter, S.J., after his studies in orientalism, to devise a new meaning for the "soul of the Church", which is a blasphemy against the Incarnation and the Virginal Mother of God.

A Catholic college whose prestige is built on the advanced degrees of its priests, bought at such a price, defeats the whole purpose, the *raison d'être,* of a Catholic college. What if students come out of Catholic colleges with less chemistry technique, but more of the Faith? Less impure "sociological" delving, but more realization of the Mother of God? Less anthropological mythology, but more of the Fathers and the Doctors? The world would be a better place, for the having of them in it. They would make less money, it is true, but they would be aiming for holiness, pleasing God, and saving their souls.

It would fare better for Catholic colleges, it seems to us, if they had, on their faculties, more *Curés d'Ars,** and less Ph.D.'s. The times in which we live are badly in need of saints in the priesthood. And we are supplying, at the present, a conforming, course-taking, liberal clergy.

Thus was the story, as we saw it, of the failure of Catholic colleges in the post-war period in America. The inroads of Liberalism had disequipped them for the strong religious leadership of their own people. But *what* underlay Liberalism? Always in every heresy there is the displacement of some central doctrine. *What* was the central doctrine in the Deposit of Faith (because every defined doctrine of the Church is either implicitly or explicitly contained in the Deposit of Faith †) which Liberalism had displaced? We set about finding out; and eventually we did find out.

---

* St. John Mary Vianney, the "Curé d'Ars," was parish priest of Ars, in France, for nearly forty-two years. He was born in 1786 and died in 1859. He was canonized by Pope Pius XI, in 1925. He had little formal learning, but he taught his spiritual children from the wisdom of his great sanctity.

† Donald Attwater, A Catholic Dictionary, p. 150. "The Deposit of Faith. That body of revelation, containing truths to be believed and principles of conduct, which was given by Christ to the Apostles, to be preserved by them and their successors, with the guarantee of infallibility, for the guidance of the Church. It embraces the truths of both Scripture and Tradition. Some of its articles are explicit in Scripture, e.g., the Word was made flesh; and others are implicit, e.g., the Immaculate Conception (q.v.). It closed with the death of the last surviving apostle. It is entrusted to the infallible *magisterium* (q.v.) of the Church to preserve, unfold and defend the Deposit. The word is found in 1 Tim. vi, 20, *Depositum custodi,* "Keep that which is committed to thy trust." . . . The term is consecrated by the Council of the Vatican (sess.iii,cap.4): "And the doctrine of faith which God revealed is proposed, not as a mere philosophical discovery to be elaborated by human minds, but as the divine Deposit delivered by Christ to his spouse, to be by her faithfully guarded and infallibly declared."

X

IN THE spring of 1947, more men resigned from Harvard in protest against its teaching. They asked to be enrolled in the Center School, and St. Benedict Center was honored to receive them.

The story of Temple Morgan is similar to that of Kevin MacGovern, Howard Cannon, or any of the students who resigned at this time. His is, perhaps, the one which caused most reverberation. Temple belonged to a family whose men had been educated at Harvard for generations. His grandfather gave to the College one of its fine old gates. Temple was a member of Harvard's Porcellian Club. There were times when we wondered whether the shock to Temple's friends was so much because he had come into the Church, or had resigned from Harvard, as it was that he renounced membership in the Porcellian Club. This last, no one seemed to be able to recover from.

Temple Morgan was an Air Force officer during the war, after which he returned to Harvard to complete his college work. He was back but a short while when he realized his complete dissatisfaction with the courses, and he told many of his friends that he would have "given the whole thing up" in December of the first year of his return if he had had anywhere else to go. It was in this frame of mind that he used to stand across the street and watch Father Feeney talk, on Thursday nights. Finally, he decided to come in. Dr. Maluf was lecturing, the night he came, and Temple liked what he had to say. He returned to the Center, that same week, to hear Father, and after that he dropped in regularly.

Temple's family had a dinner party, shortly after this, to which some of Harvard's official staff and members of the faculty were invited. The conversation turned to education in general and Harvard in particular, and one of the guests asked Temple what he thought of it. His answer was so thoroughly negative that he was prepared for a great deal of protest in reply. To his amazement, none was forthcoming.

"We don't entirely disagree with you", one of the men said. "But what would you suggest doing about it?"

Temple's reply was by way of question. "Have you", he asked, "ever thought of the Church?" Try as he would, he could not get from any one a serious answer. Later, the Senior Dean came over to him. "I was immensely interested in your remarks on education, Temp," he said, "but I don't at all agree with your solution. Don't you know that the Church is dead?"

The morning after this dinner party found Temple Morgan on the front steps of St. Benedict Center, waiting for Father Feeney to arrive.

"Father Feeney," Temple said, "what is the earliest time you could receive me into the Catholic Church?"

"Sit down, Temple," Father replied, "and let's talk about it."

Temple Morgan, with several other students, was baptized, some weeks later, on Easter Saturday afternoon. The next morning, in the burst of glory which is the Mass of Easter, he made his First Holy Communion. In the light of Him Who is Eternal Truth, all problems resolve themselves.

On the day which followed Easter, Temple again came to Father Feeney's study. He told Father that he was about to put into effect a decision he had made some time after his return to Harvard, when he had had a chance to evaluate the teaching he was receiving there in the terms of the lessons he had learned in the war. He was prevented from taking a definite stand on the matter only because he felt he hadn't solved an even more basic problem of his, the question of religion and what he owed to God. Now that that, thank God, was taken care of, he was ready for the next step.

"And what is that, Temp?" Father asked.

"To resign from Harvard", Temple answered. "I get my degree in June, but I don't want to take it."

"You're sure you've considered everything sufficiently, Temple?" Father questioned. "You realize all you will be giving up? You might want that degree some day."

"I've thought it all out, Father. Don't you think I should resign?"

"It might be a kind of stunt if you did it now. Why don't you let it go for a while?"

"Well—O.K., Father", Temple answered, and walked out of the study. In the front of the Center, he came upon Fakhri Maluf, and he told him what he had been discussing with Father, and asked his advice.

"I would not know how to answer you, Temple", Fakhri answered. "In the first place, in matters of courage you have to decide for yourself. One cannot counsel courage for another."

"Yeah," said Temple, "I guess you're right." And he left the Center, determined to finish at Harvard and get his degree. Back in his house, however, all of the old objections overwhelmed him, and he decided that there was nothing to do but leave Harvard. He went to the Dean's Office the next morning, and resigned.

Things truly began to happen to St. Benedict Center after that. One of the Deans of Harvard College was a member of Temple's family. He came over to see Father Feeney about his cousin's resignation. Father told him, simply, that he thought Temple Morgan was an extraordinarily fine and courageous person, and while his action was not what the world would call a prudent one, it had, he was relieved to say, the kind of integrity and nobility which had achieved all the great and fine things which had ever come to pass in the world. This was the kind of response which had eventually civilized the world—in the centuries when it could boast of a civilization.

The overt reaction to Temple's decision (and to St. Benedict Center in the light of it) went on for some time. A man chartered a plane and flew up from New York to see him. Temple's family in New York took to telephoning the Jesuit Provincial and Archbishop Cushing, sometimes late at night. The news finally reached even to Rome.

The Boston hierarchy, as well as the sons of St. Ignatius of Loyola, we were surprised to observe, came in for unusual attention at this time, in the form of dinner invitations from people who had heretofore held them at arm's length. This was a strange alliance. We were reminded of the famous quatrain:

And this is good old Boston,
The home of the bean and the cod,
Where the Lowells speak only to Cabots,
And the Cabots speak only to God.

We have succumbed to the temptation, as doubtless the reader has noted, of substituting "Loyolas" for "Lowells" in the above stanza, with more than unsatisfactory results.

Some time later, Temple Morgan, Fred Farrell and Richard Picardo applied, in person, to the Provincial of the Jesuit Order for admission to the Society of Jesus. Father McEleney, the Provincial, told Fred that he did not have enough Latin, and if he could make that deficiency up, he might apply the following term. Temple, he said, was not yet in the Church a sufficient length of time to make application for religious life. Richard Picardo he accepted.

Father McEleney seemed happy to talk to the boys about Father Leonard Feeney, for whom he was full of praise.

"Father Leonard", he said, "will take as much care explaining the Faith to a child as to a grown-up. He is the greatest theologian we have in the United States, by far."

The boys returned to the Center, Fred for more concentrated study in Latin, Temple to major in Greek, and Richard to prepare for entrance into the Jesuit novitiate in the fall. Four other students were studying at the Center that summer, preparatory to entering religion in September: William Gibbs, for St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, N. Y.; Richard Van Every, Kenneth Parker and William Smith, for missionary work in North Carolina; and Marion Gardiner, for the Sisters of Mercy, in Portland, Maine.

Temple Morgan and Fred Farrell never left us. As the academic year 1947-48 developed, they realized their work was at St. Benedict Center. Richard Picardo and William Gibbs later returned to us. Liberalism, we came to find out, was very well established in the seminaries of America, as well as in Catholic colleges.

Archbishop Cushing, in October of 1947, came to the Center. Notice of his coming had been posted, and the crowd which awaited his arrival, both inside the Center and outside in the little square, was so large that it was necessary to telephone for police officers to take care of the jam. Students were standing in every available place, even five abreast on the long radiators by the windows. Father Feeney presented Monsignor Hickey to the audience, and he, in turn, introduced His Excellency.

Friends later told us that never had they heard Archbishop Cushing endorse anyone so wholeheartedly as he endorsed Father Feeney, in his speech to the Center that evening. Five times, in various ways, His Excellency said that the Center had the official sanction and gratitude of the Archdiocese. If ever there were anything he could do for us, the Archbishop told us and our guests, he would be very happy indeed to do it. He had known about and was very grateful, he went on, for the religious vocations which had gone out from the Center. The Center students, he said, had the best teachers in the world.

"As regards Father Feeney," the Archbishop declared, "we feel about him the way the little boy felt, when he knelt down one night and said his prayers, this way: 'Dear God, please bless my mother and daddy, and all my aunts and uncles; and please, dear God, *please* take care of Yourself. If anything happens to *You,* the whole show's over!' "

The Center applauded His Excellency for many minutes. Father assured him of our gratitude to him, and of our love and trust in him. Remembering this evening, we were completely taken aback by Archbishop Cushing's words with reference to St. Benedict Center, the next spring, while dining at Lowell House, at Harvard College.

This particular evening in October, 1947, however, was, at the time, a most consoling one. We had been having a difficult time because of Miss Evelyn Uberti's resignation from Radcliffe College, just before the beginning of the fall term. Evelyn was an honor student at Radcliffe, and her resignation was for the same reason that the men had resigned from Harvard; she could not, in conscience, go on in sociology at Radcliffe and keep her Faith. Her parents, who had wanted the prestige of a Radcliffe degree for their brilliant daughter, were very much upset about her decision, as was the pastor of her church, in Waltham. Her pastor said he thought she should not have gone to Radcliffe in the first place, but having gone, she should stay there. Finally, Evelyn and her parents went to see Bishop Wright about the matter, and Bishop Wright sent for Father Feeney.

He told Father that there were a number of complaints against St. Benedict Center. He could, however, boil them all down to two fundamental ones: (1) Who was responsible for the censorship of articles in FROM THE HOUSETOPS?; and (2) students should not be permitted to leave Harvard and Radcliffe without the permission both of their parents and their pastors.

"What if a student is clearly losing his Faith because of attendance at these colleges; he says he is; and his parents and his pastor will do nothing about it?" Father asked His Excellency.

"Oh, that is an entirely different matter", Bishop Wright answered—as he left the whole thing definitely and evasively in mid-air.

Evelyn Uberti resigned from Radcliffe. The censorship of articles in FROM THE HOUSETOPS was left to Father Feeney, for all but his own articles, and Father's articles were to be submitted to his superior, Father Louis Gallagher, S.J. Bishop Wright said at this time that Dr. Maluf's article on "Sentimental Theology" had so stirred St. John's Seminary that a group of theologians had met to consider it.

"Did they find anything doctrinally wrong with it?" Father Feeney asked.

"No, they didn't," Bishop Wright answered, "but they said there were some controversial statements in it."

Dr. Maluf had written in his article, "Sentimental Theology":

". . . I know I am not wasting punches at a straw man. Sentimental thinking about religious matters is very much with us today. A great deal of what is being said by Catholics today sounds in very sharp contrast with the accent of the authentic voice of the Church, teaching, warning, and defining. The sharp weapons of Christ are being blunted, and the strong, virile doctrines of the Church are being put aside in a conspiracy of silence.

"While talking to a Catholic group recently, I was shocked to a realization of what is happening to the faith under the rising wave of liberalism. I happened to mention casually the Catholic dogma, *'There is no salvation outside the Church'*. Some acted as if I were uttering an innovation they had never heard before, and others had the doctrine so completely covered with reservations and vicious distinctions as to ruin its meaning and destroy the effect of its challenge. In a few minutes, the room was swarming with the slogans of liberalism and sentimentalism, utterances which are beginning to have the force of defined dogma. Taken in their totality and in the manner in which they were used and understood by their utterers, these slogans constituted an outlook incompatible with the Catholic faith and with the traditions of the Church. 'Salvation by sincerity', 'Membership in the soul of the church', 'Don't judge', 'Don't disturb the good faith of unbelievers', 'It is not charitable to talk about hell or to suggest that anybody may go there', and 'Isn't faith a gift?' and 'How about baptism of desire?' and so on. I am not concerned with these phrases as they might occur in a theological treatise with sufficient explanations and with only proportionate emphasis; I am rather concerned with a practical attitude of mind which seeks and selects precisely these phrases and builds them into a closed system of thought, ready to justify every act of cowardice, and disloyalty to the Church . . .

". . . The Catholic Church does not proclaim the exclusive salvation of one race or one class of people, but invites every man to the great joy of being united with Christ in the communion of saints. The Catholic truth is not a sad story for which we need apologize; it is a proclamation of the greatest good news that could ever be told. No matter how sternly its message is phrased, it is still the one and only hope in the world. Only love and security can afford to be severe. When we say that outside the Church there is no salvation, we are also and at the same time announcing that inside the Church there is salvation. The world already knows the sad part of our story, because the world finds no salvation in the world. The Church does not have to tell unbelievers that they are in sin and in despair; they know that in the depths of their hearts. What is new to the world in the Christian story is that, through Mary, the gates of heaven are opened and that we are invited to become brothers of Jesus in the Eternal Kingdom of God. This is not a story which can be told with the subdued and hesitant voice of sentimental theology."

September, 1947, FROM THE HOUSETOPS, *No Salvation Outside the Church*. For the first time, censorship for our magazine was being talked about. Why, we asked ourselves? Other Catholic magazines had no *imprimatur*. Had we said something that was not sound doctrine? No, we were told, we hadn't, but we had said something controversial. Was a defined doctrine of the Church controversial? No one answered us.

In February of 1948, a great honor came to St. Benedict Center. A statue of the Infant Jesus of Prague was presented to us, blessed by the Archbishop of Prague, His Excellency Josef Beran. The statue arrived on February 22nd, the day the Communists took over Czechoslovakia.

The story of the miraculous statue of the Infant Jesus of Prague is one familiar to almost every Catholic. It is a devotion which has been precious to Catholics for centuries, and grows more beautiful with time. Through it, the Christian pays homage to Him Who, even as an infant and Mary's child, was at the same time the King of Kings. The statue is dressed royally, in rich vestments for the King who was also the Great High Priest. The small right hand is raised in a Bishop's blessing, and on the infant head is a tall crown, majestic and heavy.

The statue of the Infant Jesus of Prague called forth all of Father's priesthood. He blessed us with it, spent a whole day finding the best spot in the Center in which to place it, and he was not content until he had, finally, built for it an altar, with a baldachino. He secured, through a friend, some fabulous material which had come from Japan, into which was woven, in delicate design, the sixteen-petaled golden chrysanthemum of the Mikado. This cloth covered the throne of the Infant Jesus of Prague, and fell in folds to the floor. We carried the statue to the Carmelite monastery, where Father said a Mass of thanksgiving for its coming to us. He placed the Royal Infant on the gospel side of the altar, and spoke, himself, from the epistle side.

On Sunday, May 2, 1948, over 1200 people from St. Benedict Center carried His Infant Majesty in procession through the grounds of His Excellency, the Archbishop, to the altar in the garden at the back of the Archbishop's house. The Archbishop received us, and listened to the promises of the St. Benedict Center students to the Infant Jesus, Who was so beautifully symbolized in our statue, and to the addresses which followed the promises. Archduke Rudolph, of the House of Habsburg, and Count Edmund Czernin, of Prague, were significantly among the speakers, significantly because both their families figured for centuries in the history of the miraculous statue of the Infant Jesus of Prague. It was through Count Czernin, who was a member of the Center, that the precious statue came to us. He told us:

"If Prague had remained faithful to the Infant Jesus, all that has befallen it today would not have happened. Devotion to the miraculous statue spread all over the world, and yet thousands of people in Prague knew nothing of it, cared to know nothing of it. We have had Chinese come to Prague, Americans come to Prague, people from everywhere, just to visit the statue, only to be told by someone who lived a few streets from it that he did not know where it was.

"This statue of yours is *exactly* like the original. If Prague goes down before the Communists, at least the Holy Infant is here, honored and beloved."

It was a magical afternoon, that afternoon in May, 1948, as we stood with lighted candles, singing hymns to Our Lady, with the statue of Her Infant Son resplendent upon the Archbishop's altar, in the Archbishop's presence. One year later His Excellency had placed us under interdict, and silenced our priest. And one year and two months later, over forty of our people knelt three hours on the lawn, in front of this same residence, reciting the rosary, waiting for the Archbishop to come out and speak to them; but he would not. They waited for the Archbishop to tell them why the sacrament of Matrimony was refused to the Center boy and girl whose wedding day it was to be; they waited for the Archbishop to tell them why they should be penalized for professing the doctrine that was at once the protection of the Infant Jesus of Prague, their own protection, and the protection of their children to come. But the Archbishop would not come out; he would not answer them.

By another strange turn, Archduke Rudolph wrote us after the "Boston Heresy Case". We were flying in the face of tradition, he told us, to persist in standing on doctrine when discipline was in question. Poor Archduke Rudolph—tradition was all he had. We could see at last what had happened to the House of Habsburg. If it had had courage to fight for the Faith, the only thing worth fighting for, it would have had the courage also to preserve its throne. Tradition, and nothing else, is not enough. Doctrine *is* tradition. If the Communists come to Boston, it will not be because St. Benedict Center has not had the courage to guard the Infant Jesus of Prague!

XI

IN 1947-1948 Philip Gammans, Robert Colopy, Charles Forgeron resigned from Harvard. Philip Gammans' father and grandfather were Harvard men. Philip Gammans and Charles Forgeron entered the Center school, and Robert Colopy transferred to Holy Cross College, since he wished to go on with his premedical studies. There he discovered, much to his chagrin, that secular standardization, combined with Catholic Liberalism, had made for the same materialism at Holy Cross which he had found at Harvard. His friends at St. Benedict Center were more and more under siege for holding to their beliefs, and he knew that it had to be the whole way, for him, or nothing. Compromise wouldn't do, and Holy Cross was compromise. And so he wrote another letter, this time to the Dean of Holy Cross, submitting his resignation, and he came back to take up the fight at St. Benedict Center.

In May, 1948, John Lucal, Robert Miller, Raymond Karam resigned from Harvard, Lenore Miller from Radcliffe, to be followed later by John MacIsaac from Harvard, and Tom Mulcahy, Brendan McGovern, and Joseph Roche from Boston College. All of the men who resigned from Harvard, Holy Cross and Boston College were war veterans, with the exception of one.

After these withdrawals, the storm signals, presaging disaster for St. Benedict Center, set up a loud blare. The father of one of our students, a high ranking member of the Harvard faculty, wrote his son a letter in which he said: "The President and Fellows of Harvard College are taking the matter of Father Feeney under serious consideration."

The alarm reached us from still another front. The Catholic wife of a man who had been on the faculty at Harvard wrote her sister telling her that Catholics of prominence, who were outraged and ashamed that Father Feeney should be talking so plainly, had taken the matter into their own hands; and a scheme had been worked out which would take care of the removal of Father Feeney and St. Benedict Center. Part of the scheme was read to us over the telephone.

While we were thinking about these things, one of the students came in and reported that Bishop Wright was speaking that evening at Harvard, at the Liberal Union, on "Conscription". I don't know what its reputation is today, but at that time the Liberal Union was known to be what might be called far "left" politically. The general opinion about the Harvard Liberal Union was a very well defined one, and, no matter what ideas the Center men had on conscription, it gave them no pleasure to learn that a Catholic Bishop was speaking against conscription *there*. Some of them went over to see for themselves.

One or two nights later, word was brought to us that Archbishop Cushing was dining at Lowell House, one of the large Harvard houses. Now, this dinner was part of the plan mentioned in the letter which had been read to us, which was to bring about the end of St. Benedict Center,—not because St. Benedict Center was not telling the truth, but because it was not telling the truth in quiet and measured words, in general phrases intelligible only to the few and which would move no one to do anything about it. The Center was shouting from the housetops, and this was offending people.

The reports of the dinner disturbed us. Three or four of the Center students had resigned from Lowell House. These students did not bring to such an action the judgments of immature undergraduates. It could in no sense be said of them that they were carried away by the "magnetism" of Father Feeney. The students were men who had spent several years in the army and the navy, fighting for their country in various parts of the world. They had learned the ways of the world, had had to make mature judgments under all sorts of circumstances. They had taken months to test, to think over a step of such proportions in their life as resignation from a famous college, and from a college house which offered as much in the way of facilities and comfort as Lowell House. Nevertheless, as Catholic men they had had the integrity and courage to resign. They knew the report of their resignations from Harvard had come to the Archbishop and the Bishop. They thought the Archbishop would be proud of them, and here he was, himself, dining at High Table in Lowell House. Saddest of all, they knew why he had been asked to that dinner.

The reports of the dinner, as I say, thoroughly alarmed us. Students who had been there brought us the news. The dinner was the common topic of conversation everywhere, for in the midst of Harvard professors and students, the Archbishop had discussed the very existence of St. Benedict Center, and its teachings. One of the Harvard students at the dinner asked him, "Do you approve of St. Benedict Center?" And our Archbishop, who several months before had been the guest of the Center and had publicly endorsed it to the skies, who had written two articles which were featured in the Center's magazine FROM THE HOUSETOPS, replied to the diners at the head table of Lowell House: "I don't know anything about them. I was invited over there to speak once, and I spoke there. But I speak anywhere. I am not sure that I approve of their method. I will have to look into that."

We couldn't believe it. The boys decided it was necessary to see the Archbishop and tell him the stories they had heard. They set out, two days after the dinner, for his residence. Now, there is at the Center a collection of books which are known as the "Center Log", containing reports of Center happenings. The Center Log on the meeting of the boys with Archbishop Cushing relates the following:

> After first going to the Chancery building to see Bishop Wright, and finding him not at home, we went to the Archbishop's House.
>
> We had come on our own as members of St. Benedict Center, a lay organization. Our purpose was to find out, first, if the rumors we had heard to the effect that the Center was to be closed were true; second, whether it was true that the Archbishop had said that he was not too sure that he approved of the way St. Benedict Center was being run; third, we wished to present our side of the case, knowing that up to this time (although we were now told that many had complained against St. Benedict's since the HOUSETOPS had come out and since the college resignations) we had never defended ourselves. In short, our purpose was that we, the students of St. Benedict Center, of our own accord, had decided to take steps to see that the Archbishop learned both sides of the story. We were coming to him as his loyal children to ask his support.
>
> When we arrived, the Archbishop came in to see us immediately. He asked jokingly if we were a contingent protesting military conscription.
>
> We said, "We have come here, Your Excellency, because we have heard that St. Benedict Center is going to be closed down."
>
> The Archbishop answered that we were old enough not to believe in rumors, and that if St. Benedict Center was to be closed down there would be a thorough hearing, both sides being allowed to present their case.
>
> We told him that we needed his support for our work at Harvard. He replied, "If we didn't support you, you would be shut down."

We answered, "We don't think your going to Lowell House, and the Bishop's going to speak at the Harvard Liberal Union, is support."

"Well, it wasn't my idea to go over there", the Archbishop told us. "I didn't even know where the Lowell House was. The Chancery Office told me that it would be a good thing to go over there. I would eat anywhere. I would eat with Stalin if he invited me. The subject of St. Benedict Center only came up once. Some boy asked me what I thought of St. Benedict Center: 'Do you approve of them?' I told him, 'I don't know anything about them. I was invited over there to speak once, and I spoke there. But I speak anywhere. I am not sure that I approve of their method. I will have to look into that.' " The Archbishop confirmed the story. That *had* been his conversation!

We then spoke about Bishop Wright's talk at the Liberal Union and the effect which that talk and the supper at Lowell House had upon our work. We said that everybody at Harvard knows that the Center stands in opposition to the teachings at Harvard, and that these two visits from the hierarchy seemed a repudiation by the hierarchy of the work of the Center.

The Archbishop repeated several times during this part of the interview, "This is all a revelation to me!" He said that he knew nothing about anyone leaving Harvard, nor about the vocations from the Center, nor the school, nor the HOUSETOPS, nor any of the work of the Center, nor Father Feeney's many conversions!

We then told him about Harvard. Several of us who had done work in the various fields discussed the situation in those fields. He said that he knew nothing about Harvard, or that many Catholic boys lost their Faith there. We told him how few Catholics went regularly to Mass. He replied, "If all the Catholics in Boston went to church, there wouldn't be enough room for them all in the churches!"

We mentioned the apostate priest, LaPiana, who had been teaching Church History at Harvard for years (and who had tried forcibly to throw Father Feeney out of his house when Father Feeney went there in an attempt to bring him back to his Faith). The Archbishop's only reaction to Father LaPiana was calmly to say, "Oh, he's been over there for years."

We told him what our program was, about our school and about the study of the Doctors themselves, and the Scriptures. He said that there were more Catholics at Boston University (a secular college not to be confused with Boston College) alone than at all the Catholic colleges of New England put together. He talked about Boston College and other Catholic schools. He told us that Boston College was not teaching religion. "Why doesn't Father Feeney go over to Boston College", he said, "and do something about that?"

He told us that there weren't enough Catholic colleges to hold all the Catholics (just as he passed off the fact that many students did not attend Mass by the fact that the churches wouldn't hold them all). We said that we thought that this was not a good situation.

The Archbishop told us to go and see Bishop Wright; "he takes care of all those things."

Before leaving, we brought up again the question of the closing of St. Benedict Center. The Archbishop assured us that there would be no steps to close the Center. If the question ever came up "there would be a thorough investigation." We would have a complete hearing, and a chance to present our case. He said that he wouldn't think of closing down an organization that had such zeal, and that it would be very much against his interests to suppress such a group of boys.

We asked for and received his blessing.

The next day, the boys called on Bishop Wright. He said that he would not see the whole group together, but asked for two representatives to be sent in. David Thomson and David Supple went in to see the Bishop. Bishop Wright wanted to discuss the affair with the two boys, but they insisted that the whole group must be present, due to the importance of the matter. The Center Log reports the meeting:

Bishop Wright was very angry with us because we had gone over his head to the Archbishop. We explained that he had not been in, and that we had then gone to see the Archbishop, but only after first trying to see him. Why hadn't we waited until he returned? We told him that the Center had been threatened with being closed, and we considered it such an urgent matter that we could not wait. He told us that we were grown men and should be more mature, and should not listen to every rumor we heard.

We explained that we had several sources of evidence that the Center was going to be closed, but he said he knew nothing about any of them. We made some criticism of the Archbishop's presence at the Lowell House dinner, at which the activities of the Center were under question. The Bishop said, "There will be no discussion of where, when and why the Archbishop eats dinner. He will go where he wants and when he wants. Is that quite clear?"

We mentioned again that the existence of the Center and the teachings of the Center were under question at this dinner, and that the Archbishop by his remarks to those present (Harvard professors and students) had undermined the work of the Center. Also, what the Archbishop had said would lead us to believe that he not only questioned whether the Center were teaching true Catholic doctrine, but that he planned to investigate the Center and close it. We reminded the Bishop that the men to whom the Archbishop was speaking were not our friends, and that he had discussed our very existence with them. Whereupon, in a very firm and decisive manner, the Bishop said, "We *have* no enemies!" We said we were speaking about the enemies of the *Church*. He insisted that the Church had no enemies. We were appalled at this statement, and asked him, "What about the Communists, in Russia, in the countries of eastern Europe?" He answered that they weren't our enemies. They were merely misguided!

We made an appointment with Bishop Wright for an interview with the whole group on the next Thursday morning.

The Center Log goes on:

The Meeting of the Boys with Bishop Wright
One week after the first meeting.

After we had waited exactly one half hour, Bishop Wright entered the room. He spent twenty-five minutes outlining procedure "in order to save time, for he was very busy." He spent twenty-five minutes laying out such rules of speech as limiting us to one adjective to a noun. He set forth three topics for discussion: (1) Harvard, (2) The Center and Harvard, (3) The Center and the Church. Almost every point we brought up for discussion was deferred by him as belonging to one of the other two topics not then under discussion.

We began the talk by saying that we were come as children to our Bishop. Bishop Wright answered, "I take for granted that you come as children to your bishop." However, he then outlined the rules of grammar for our talk. We repeated several times, "But we come as your children!" until finally he said, "I am *not* your bishop! The Archbishop is!" (The Archbishop had told us that we were to go to see the Bishop.) Bishop Wright added: "We are all meeting here as Catholic men met to discuss the problems of the Church." And so he continued to discuss procedure.

We discussed Harvard as much as possible under the rules of procedure. Bishop Wright said, "There are two methods of dealing with non-Catholics. *The method of infiltration, which I prefer; and the direct method, which is the method Father Feeney uses.* Both methods have a tradition in the Church." He gave us several names which he considered to be on one side or the other.

One of us said, "The important thing is that the truth should be told, rather than a concentration on what manner of method is to be used. Our Lord said, 'Do not be solicitous about what you say, for it will be given to you.' So the important thing is that Father Feeney is telling the truth to the students of Harvard. That's more important than the method. But if you want to speak of method, Our Lord Himself tells us how to tell His Truth: 'The Kingdom of Heaven is taken by violence' and 'shake the dust' and 'whosoever does not heed the admonition of the Church, let him be to you like the publican and the heathen.' And St. Paul said, 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid.' "

Then the Bishop said: "Christ also said, 'If your enemy forces you to walk with him one mile, walk with him two.' "

Raymond Karam answered, "What if you have walked the second mile with him?"

The Bishop had nothing to answer.

Bishop Wright said, "The Church has no enemies. The war is between the *Civitas Dei* and the *Civitas Satanae,* not between the Church and the institutions of unbelievers."

The way Bishop Wright developed this theory of his shocked all of us, because it was clear that he conceived of the war as being between two purely spiritual kingdoms, and that we men had nothing to do with this war, but were helplessly used by one side or the other. It sounded Manichean. And what about the Visible Church, the Church Militant, we asked ourselves? This was a queer way for a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church to talk.

Again he criticized Father Feeney's method of dealing with Catholic students who were studying in secular colleges. He gave us the example of an unnamed girl (who, we knew, was Evelyn Uberti) who had left Radcliffe College against her parents' will. When we said, "She certainly felt she could not stay there in conscience without seriously endangering her Faith", he said, "Even then, leaving a school against her parents' will is against the Natural Law." We answered, "In matters like this, where a person's Faith is seriously endangered, one is allowed to act against one's parents' will." Bishop Wright replied, "It is against the Natural Law to disobey one's parents in anything. I believe in the Natural Law just as firmly as I believe in God!"

This completely astounded us!

Apart from the method used by Father (the direct method), he said that he had nothing against the Center. Except, however, he did add that an article which appeared in the HOUSETOPS was questioned and examined by a board of theologians

> The article was found to be very controversial. (This was Dr. Maluf's article, "Sentimental Theology", which contained the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church.) Bishop Wright said, "As a result, I had to ask Father Feeney to have the HOUSETOPS censored. Father Feeney said that he was competent to censor the articles which were submitted to him. Then I told him it would be wiser if at least he submitted his own contributions to be censored by some theologian of his own choice, and Father Feeney chose Father Gallagher."
>
> Aside from this, Bishop Wright said he had no criticism of Father Feeney or the Center. He said that he had always thought that the Center was all right, but now he was starting to suspect it because of the jitteryness of us all.
>
> We answered that we were not jittery, but that we had heard reliable reports that the Archbishop and the Chancery did not approve of the Center and of Father's teachings. Bishop Wright said, "If anyone should question my orthodoxy I would not worry, unless it were the Pope."
>
> He ended by reassuring us that there was no danger for the Center.

Despite this promise, however, the Center men came away from the interview with Bishop Wright disturbed, and vaguely apprehensive.

XII

IT WAS no secret, in the fall and winter of 1947-1948, that St. Benedict Center was teaching the age-old, defined doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church nor without personal submission to the Pope. The faculty of Boston College was aware of it, and had begun already to make its feelings on the subject known to the two St. Benedict Center men then on its faculty, Dr. Fakhri Maluf and Mr. James R. Walsh. Mr. Charles Ewaskio did not join the Faculty of Boston College until the fall of 1948.

Sometime after Dr. Maluf's article "Sentimental Theology" appeared in FROM THE HOUSETOPS (in September, 1947), Father John Ryan, S.J., head of the Adult Education Institute, of Boston College, met Dr. Maluf, and began to discuss with him his next course in Adult Education. Dr. Maluf told Father Ryan that he would like to give a course in Apologetics.

"No, you had better stick to something like Logic or Cosmology", Father Ryan answered.

"May I know why, Father?" Dr. Maluf asked.

"I do not agree with Father Feeney's doctrine on salvation outside the Church", Father Ryan replied.

"What is your doctrine, Father, on this subject?" Fakhri questioned, startled. "I know that Father Feeney's doctrine is the doctrine of the Church, and if you teach a different doctrine I would be very much concerned to determine definitely which of us is in error, because I am completely with Father Feeney."

Father Ryan looked at his watch. "I have an appointment now. We will have to discuss it some other time." Then he added, in a conciliatory voice, "Please choose some topic similar to the ones which have been already approved."

Toward the end of May, 1948, the Rev. Stephen A. Mulcahy, S.J., Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of Boston College, summoned Mr. James R. Walsh, then a student in philosophy and instructor in mathematics at Boston College, to discuss with him his appointment as instructor in philosophy at the College for the next year. As one of the conditions imposed by Father Mulcahy, Mr. Walsh was asked not to teach at Boston College what the Dean termed "Father Feeney's doctrine that there is no salvation outside the Church".

"But this is a defined dogma of the Catholic Faith", Mr. Walsh objected.

"We have the Department of Religion to take care of these matters," Father Mulcahy answered, "and I am not having a religious controversy with you. Boston College has gone on very well for over seventy years without bringing this question up, and you're not to teach it now. You are to teach philosophy, of which theology is only the negative norm, so there is no reason for you to talk outside your field. We don't want men here going home and telling a non-Catholic father or mother that they have heard this doctrine at Boston College, thus causing their parents to have erroneous consciences."

"But this might be the cause of their salvation, Father", Mr. Walsh protested.

"And it might not", Father Mulcahy answered. "But I don't intend to discuss the matter with you. I'm just telling you not to teach it."

As time went on, more and more instances brought home to us the realization that Boston College and St. Benedict Center were miles apart on the doctrine of salvation. Dr. Maluf tells the story of walking into the lay faculty room at Boston College one morning, as a member of the Chemistry Department was saying to a group of sympathetic listeners:

"I have a neighbor, an Episcopalian, a perfect Christian. He believes all that we believe, and I wish more Catholics were as sincere as he is. He is a High Churchman, and the only reason he does not become a Catholic is that he values his liberty too much to submit to the authority of the Pope. We are a Democracy here. We do not believe in bowing to potentates and kings and all such nonsense."

"So while this man had started talking about an Episcopalian," Dr. Maluf told us, "he ended up expounding his own views on the subject, which did not differ from those of his Episcopalian friend. There was not the slightest suggestion that submission to the Pope was necessary for salvation, and so common is this type of conversation in the Faculty Room that not only were there no protests on the part of at least ten professors who were listening to him, but there was not even a show of surprise."

Sometime in this winter of 1947-1948, while the campaign for the new building fund for Boston College was going on, Father Francis McManus, S.J., walked into one of Dr. Maluf's classes during a quiz period, and asked if he might be allowed to address the students on behalf of the drive for funds.

"I am appealing to you to get behind the drive for the Business School Building", Father McManus said. "You know that Boston College is for all denominations. We do not proselytize here. Students come to Boston College from all religions, and nobody bothers them about their beliefs."

This statement was most certainly a far cry from St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit Order. No one would for a moment deny that it was excellent technique for obtaining funds for a new building, but neither could one deny that it placed a most awful responsibility upon Boston College and made one seriously question the Faith of the priest speaking. That a priest ordained to teach the one Truth by which men attain their salvation should promise non-Catholic men sitting before him (and there were several in Dr. Maluf's class) that Boston College would not "bother" them about their religious beliefs was bad enough, but that this policy should be advanced as an inducement for giving money for a new building for the College, was indeed a shocking thing.

We had thought President James Bryant Conant's speech at the Memorial Church services at Harvard, in the fall of 1947, strange enough. The *Harvard Crimson* reported President Conant's speech:

> *'Agnostic Faith' Is Conant Topic Today*
>
> In a speech scheduled for delivery at Memorial Church services this morning President Conant will take for his theme the biblical text, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?"
>
> Confronted with "the admittedly grim prospects of the present," President Conant recognizes that men with "solid faith . . . founded on religious beliefs" are best able to maintain composure and integrity.
>
> For agnostics, with no reliance on the supernatural to support them, he suggests reference to the theory of probabilities. Instead of becoming paralyzed by the fear of a coming war, they should ponder the prospect that there is "just as good a chance that we will see the beginning of an effective world government in the next ten years as that we shall witness the total obliteration of the heavily industrialized nations."

We tried to determine how, in some way, *agnostic* and *faith* were not contradictories, one of the other. In what would an agnostic have faith, we wondered—in his own power never to be able to know? If anything could be of comfort to an agnostic, we supposed the theory of probabilities might possibly supply it, but we were fairly sure that the 26th President of

Harvard College, in his Memorial Church speech, would give very little comfort to the founding fathers of Harvard, were they sitting in the congregation. Most of the founding fathers were Protestant ministers, still close enough, at the time the college was founded, to the tradition of the Faith to have laughed to scorn the notion of a serious agnosticism.

But whatever President Conant's founders might think about his ideas, we had no doubt at all as to what the founder of the Society of Jesus would think about Boston College.

We were not less disturbed, during this winter of 1947-1948, by what we were reading in the newspapers of the public utterances of the local hierarchy. The *Boston Daily Globe,* Monday, February 16, 1948, under the heading "Archbishop Asks End to Feuding Among Religions", quotes Archbishop Richard J. Cushing as "calling for an end of feuding over religious dogmas and a resurgence of tolerance and magnanimity".

"We cannot any longer", His Excellency said, "afford the luxury of fighting one another over doctrines concerning the next world, though we must not compromise these. We are faced with a situation in which all men of good will must unite their forces to save what is worth saving in this world."

What, we asked ourselves after reading this speech, does the Archbishop think is "worth saving in this world"? A Catholic archbishop, of all people, should know that the thing most worth saving for each man is his immortal soul. Life even in a democracy—supposing the Archbishop had in mind, in his speech, Democracy as opposed to Communism—would last but a few short years compared with the eternity of years to be lived after death. And suppose, by preserving the one, man lost the other? We could understand the President of the United States talking in the manner of Archbishop Cushing, since his function is to take care of the temporal welfare of the people of the United States, but we could not understand a Bishop of the Catholic Church speaking in such a fashion, since his concern is for the spiritual welfare of his people and has to do with this world only in terms of the next. St. Paul has told us that we have not here a lasting city,* and to forget for a moment the sacrosanct character of that which he was consecrated to guard (the precious Deposit of Faith), even in an exigency as serious as Communism, is a dangerous thing for an archbishop to do.

St. Paul would not have agreed with Archbishop Cushing in his assertion that fighting for a doctrine constitutes a luxury, to be put aside for some temporal reason (no matter how pressing that might be). St. Paul said, "I have fought the good fight. I have kept the Faith." It is no small achievement, in any age, to keep one's Faith, and to cease to be vigilant at all times for the preservation of it is to invite disaster before which even the consequences of Communism seem mild.

Furthermore, to think for one instant that we are professing the Faith merely because we are not compromising the doctrines is the end of all apostolic life.

On Sunday, August 8, 1948, Archbishop Cushing, speaking at Milton, Massachusetts, made some statements which turned out to be of the utmost significance to St. Benedict Center.

"I cannot understand any Catholic who has any prejudice whatsoever against a Jew or other non-Catholic", Archbishop Cushing told "5000 friends and benefactors of St. Columban's Seminary, Brush Hill Road".

"If there is any Catholic organization harboring such prejudices," he said, "I will assume the responsibility of remedying it. A Catholic cannot harbor animosity against men, women and children of another creed, nationality or color."

He added, states the *Boston Globe* for the next day, that "some of the finest benefactors to the Boston Catholic Archdiocese are non-Catholics".

---

* Hebrews, 13-14.

Two weeks after this announcement, Father Leonard Feeney was ordered to leave St. Benedict Center and go to Holy Cross College in Worcester, which is outside the diocese of Boston.

Does St. Benedict Center come under the category described by Archbishop Cushing? Of course it does not, but we knew when we read the newspaper account of this speech of the Archbishop that he undoubtedly had no one else in mind, because the accusations contained in it were often made of St. Benedict Center since our avowal of the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Church. The President of Boston College, Father Keleher, said the same thing of us later on, and it was headlined in the newspapers.

St. Benedict Center is made up of people from many nations. Its members have come, at one time or another, not only from most of the countries of Europe and Great Britain (students here on exchange scholarships), but from China, Japan, India, South America, Mexico, the Philippines, Costa Rica, Puerto Rico, Trinidad. Furthermore, to be a member of St. Benedict Center was to enter into a family relationship, one with another, as is the way of foundations which bear the name of St. Benedict. We are not Benedictines, as the word has reference to the ancient Order of St. Benedict, but every Benedictine monk of the Order who has visited us—and many have—has always remarked that there is a family spirit in St. Benedict Center very much like to that in Benedictine houses. Among ourselves, we speak of "the Center Family". We found no difficulty living with men and women of other nations, in fact it was our delight, and we received from it entirely as much as we ever gave in the way of friendship and love.

And so St. Benedict Center could not be said to harbor animosity against "men, women and children of another nationality".

Many of the Center members from countries outside the United States were of different strains of blood, coming as they did from the Far East, the Middle East, the Near East, and Africa. It was common knowledge that one of the persons St. Benedict Center seemed to make most fuss about was a girl in whom color of skin was only an enhancement of her spiritual genius and beauty.

And so those who know St. Benedict Center know that it holds no animosity for people on the basis of their color.

Now, Father Feeney is well known for the number of his Jewish converts and friends. There is much in the Jewish people which Father admires—a life, vivacity, warmth, capacity for deep spirituality. He never finds it difficult to get down to fundamental truths with a Jew. He invariably says to him, "What is the matter with you? The Queen of Heaven is a little Jewish girl!" Some of the Center members are Jews who have come into the Faith.

And so, race as such is not inimical to St. Benedict Center.

What is it, then, which makes St. Benedict Center at cross purposes with Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright? (Very often Archbishop Cushing is merely carrying out some plan of Bishop Wright's, we discovered.) It is simply a question of truth and of charity, and it involves the third of the Archbishop's distinctions made in his speech at Milton—that of creed.

St. Benedict Center does not hold that it is truth or that it is charity, either to ourselves or to anyone else, to tell men, in order to create social good feeling, to meet a political expediency, or to receive donations of money, that we do not care what their creed is, and that the things we hold in common are more important than the things on which we differ, when the things on which we differ are God and our salvation. We believe it is charity to say to our neighbor not so much "You are going to hell!" as "Are you going to heaven?"

The time and opportunity were given St. Benedict Center, by reason of its school, to study at length Holy Scripture, Church History, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, the Popes and Councils. We came to know well the teaching of the Church on salvation. The Church has always taught the doctrine of no salvation outside it, since the Church is *One,* Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, founded by Jesus Christ on Peter, the first of the Apostles.

St. Paul, in 2 Corinthians, chapter 6, verse 2, says: "Behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation." It is not the way of the Church, when it is fulfilling perfectly the mission given it by Jesus Christ, to hold back for any reason the full truth from the people at any time, because *now* is the acceptable time, *now* is the day of salvation for hundreds of thousands.

We have been accused, at times, of being Communists because of the dissension among Catholics * which has resulted from our insistence on professing the doctrine of the Church on salvation *as it was defined,* and not as it has been interpreted by liberal theologians, or even by liberal Popes, who were speaking not *ex cathedra* (not infallibly), but in encyclicals. This is no time to bring about divisions, we were told; it is, rather, a time to forget everything else in the need to present a united front against Communism. We replied that, horrible though Communism is, there is an even greater danger to man. Our Lord says (Matt. 10-28): "And fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell." It would be no conquest at all if we united together against Communism, only, through the neglect of what God has commanded, to lose the spiritual battle, and go to hell. We have to win both—the battle against Communism so that we may live in freedom here on earth, and the war against the Prince of Darkness, the devil, so that we may live in beatitude with God for all eternity.

---

* Non-Catholics, for the most part, were surprised only that so many Catholics should be unaware of what, to non-Catholics, was such a well-known dogma of the Church.

And, too, in the very practical order, there is the consideration that when it came to a matter of saving their lives and property against an aggressor, Americans outside the Church would not allow the question of what the Catholic Church taught on salvation to be a matter of division. They would not allow the doctrine to stand in the way of accepting Catholic help in battle, or of fighting side by side with Catholics in the war. On the contrary, they would be most anxious to secure both. There is also the further thought, we answered our Liberal Catholic accusers, that now that, as a result of the controversy, people outside the Church have been reminded of what the Catholic Church has taught on salvation, Catholics could no longer claim for their non-Catholic friends the questionable distinction of "invincible ignorance", one of the categories by which, the Liberals assert, most people outside the Church get to heaven.

We have been told that what we are saying amounts to the declaration that all Catholics get to heaven, and this, of course, we deny. Starting out on the right road is still but the beginning of the journey. There are other conditions to be met on the way. But it *is* the beginning. Father Feeney once said in reply to this question:

"I don't say that being in the Catholic Church alone saves you. I say that it is a 'conditio sine qua non'. If you just go over and stand on the road to New York, you won't get there. You have to go along the road. But, if you get on the wrong road to New York, it doesn't make any difference whether you go along it or stand on it. It is just the wrong road. It is not the road to New York."

With presumptuous optimism, the Liberals promise heaven to everyone. Their words, as they tell it, are very pretty, but it is, unfortunately, a promise destined to go unfulfilled.* One night, at St. Benedict Center, Sister Mary Madeleva, who is President of a college which includes a school of Theology, told us, in her lady-like manner, that nobody goes to hell. Our students were shocked at this utterance. They knew it was not a mere pleasantry. It is consonant with Sister Madeleva's theology, and is the kind of Liberalism which, saddest of all places in the world, has begun to infest our convents.

The newspapers and the radio, these last few years, have deplored, over and over again, religious designations (such as Catholics, Protestants, or Jews) as unfortunate, implying, as they do, religious division. Did we not learn, they ask, the lesson of the last war, which was (they explain) that men of all creeds fought side by side for their country? St. Benedict Center has been tempted inelegantly to reply, "So what?" We understood that our men were fighting for a temporal good, that of our country. We did not know they were fighting for a spiritual good, that of our eternal home. Was it, then, a religious war, and is our state our religion? That seemed to have been Mussolini's confusion. We were told that one of President Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms" was Freedom of Religion, and we did not know that there followed upon allegiance to one's country the forced obligation of avowal of a national religion.

---

* Luke, XIII, 23: *Then said one unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved?* The Great Commentary of Cornelius a Lapide (translated by Thomas W. Mossman, Edinburgh: John Grant, 1908) Vol. 4, Ch. XIII, p. 340: "Christ answered in the affirmative that few should be saved, as S. Luke signified and S. Matt. plainly states, vii,14. Isaiah speaks to the same effect, x.22;xxiv.13. Understand 'few' by a comparison of all the inhabitants of the whole world; or of the faithful with the unbelieving, for all the latter are condemned for their unbelief, and equally many of the faithful for their wicked lives. The faithful alone are saved, and not all of these. But whether the greater number of them are saved or lost is the question. Some think that the greater number are saved, through the holy sacraments (which very many of them only receive at the end of their lives). Others think that most are lost because they live in a state of mortal sin. The rule of S. Augustine is that as men have lived, so they die. . . . The judgment of S. Chrysostom, Homily xl. to the Antiochenes, who numbered 100,000 or more, is formidable. 'In our city,' he says, 'among so many thousands, scarcely can 100 be found who will be saved, for in the youngers is great wickedness, and in the elders deadness.' And S. Augustine (Bk.iv.ch.53, against Dresconius) compares the Church to a threshing-floor, on which there is much more chaff than grain, i.e., more reprobate than elect."

Can it be said, then—to return to Archbishop Cushing's speech at Milton—that St. Benedict Center "harbors animosity against men . . . of another creed"? The dictionary defines *animosity* as "active and vehement hatred". I doubt if it could be said that an ardent desire for the company of all men in the House of one's Father, or a literal adherence to Him Whom the Father sent, constitutes an active and vehement hatred of men of another creed. St. Benedict Center calls it charity, in the sense of love.

The Archbishop's speech was relayed to St. Benedict Center from several sources. It disturbed us very much when we first read it, but we reassured ourselves with the promises of both Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright—that nothing would happen to St. Benedict Center without a hearing. We trusted them completely, and so were comforted.

A week or so later, His Excellency and Bishop Wright sailed for Rome, on a pilgrimage to the tomb of Pope Pius X. We did not realize, as the ship sailed, how intimately connected was its sailing with the fate of St. Benedict Center.

XIII

THE Center Log for the week of August 25, 1948, one of the saddest weeks in our lives, contains the following documents and testimony:

August 25, 1948 *

Dear Father Feeney: PC

You are to go from St. Benedict Center to Holy Cross College. You are to report there on September 8th. This will give you time to report at Holy Cross and get things cleared up at St. Benedict Center. I am sure you will be very happy in your new position and will continue to do as wonderful work as you have in the past. I have already informed the Vicar General of this change.

(SIGNED) *J. J. McEleney, S.J.*
Provincial.

(The Vicar General of the archdiocese of Boston was Monsignor Augustine Hickey, of St. Paul's Church, Cambridge, who was in charge of the archdiocese in the Archbishop's absence.)

Upon reception of the above letter, Father Feeney called the Provincial, and asked if he could see him. The Provincial replied, "Yes. You may come, if you wish." Father went immediately to the Provincial's residence, and the conversation was as follows:

---

* As recorded from Father Feeney's and our memories just a few days after its reception. This and the answer of Bishop Wright on page 123 are the only two documents not quoted from the originals, but recorded shortly after reception, from memory.

Father: "What is the point of my being changed, Father?"

Provincial: "Higher Authorities."

Father: "What higher authorities?"

Provincial: "We can't go into that."

Father: "You mean by higher authorities the Archbishop or the Bishop?"

Provincial: "I'm not saying it was anyone. You are being changed, dear Father, for the good of the Province."

Father: "But I don't work just for the good of the Province. I work for the greater glory of God. I was down in the status for the year as assigned to St. Benedict Center." ["Status" is the name given by the Jesuits to the publication of assignments for the following year, for all the members of the Society. Status occurs at the very beginning of the summer, never later than July 31st.]

Provincial: "Yes, I know, but you are now changed."

Father: "You have already written to Monsignor Hickey?"

Provincial: "Yes."

Father: "Don't you think it would have been decent of you, Father, to have called me in and discussed it with me first, before you wrote to Monsignor?"

Provincial: "Maybe I should have."

Father: "It isn't too late to change now."

Provincial: "I'm afraid it is."

Father: "Well, can't you revoke the decision?"

Provincial: "No, Father, I am not in a position to do that."

Father: "Well, would you, if you could?"

Provincial: "No, I don't think I would."

Father: "But, Father, you have never heard my side of the story on St. Benedict Center, and I thought that because you were leaving me alone and trusting me that what I was doing was agreeable to you. What is being objected to in what I am doing?"

Provincial: “Your doctrine.”

Father: “My doctrine on what?”

Provincial: “I’m sorry, we can’t go into that.”

Father: “Won’t you tell me what it was so that I can defend myself?”

Provincial: “I’m sorry, Father, the letter has already gone to the Vicar General, and I’m sure you will respect my wishes and go to Holy Cross on September 8th.”

Father: “Father, this is going to be the worst scandal that ever happened if you kick me out this way. The students of St. Benedict Center are committed to me in the school for a whole year. They have given up their homes (many of them come from out of State), and you can’t ask this of them. I was appointed in status time. I beg you, in the name of Mary, Father, please reconsider it.

“I’m older than you in the Society, and I am telling you, Father, that the hundreds of boys and girls who have trusted me, and all the children I have in religion, will be scandalized if you throw me out like this without warning, without a hearing. They will be confused if you tell them my doctrine is wrong, without a hearing on that doctrine.”

Provincial: “We have considered all that.”

Father: “Won’t you think it over, Father?”

Provincial: “I will think it over.”

Father: “May I come and see you tomorrow?”

Provincial: “You are always free to come and see me.”

Father: “I will come and see you tomorrow.”

Provincial: “Well, I will call you on the ’phone tomorrow, and let you know.”

The next morning, August 26th, Father telephoned the Provincial, and said:

Father: “Father Provincial?”

Provincial: “Yes.”

Father: “This is Father Feeney.”

Provincial: “Yes, Father.”

Father: “Will it be all right if I come over and see you this morning?”

Provincial: “You are always free to come and see me.”

Father: “Have you thought over the matter we discussed?”

Provincial: “Yes, Father, I have.”

Father: “Is there any hope?”

Provincial: “I’m afraid there isn’t, Father.”

Father: “You mean your mind is made up, and under no circumstances will you change it?”

Provincial: “Yes. I’m afraid that is the way the matter stands, Father. Your successor will be appointed within two or three days.”

Father: “They don’t want anyone but me over there now.”

Provincial: “Your successor will be appointed.”

Father: “That is all, Father?”

Provincial: “That is all.”

Father told Catherine Clarke of this conversation, and she drove to the Provincial’s residence, and asked to see him. She was told he was out, but Father Murray, S.J., the Provincial’s Secretary, came down. He was cold and unbending. This was the conversation:

Catherine Clarke: “Father, I am sorry that Father McEleney is not able to see me. I will tell you what I have come to see him about, and will you tell him, please? I will telephone you later in the day for an appointment with him. I would like to explain the whole matter to him.

“I have come about the removal of Father Feeney. This sudden removal of Father is a most distressing and unfair thing. We were assured that Father would be with us for another year at the Jesuit status time, and upon that assurance we made plans for the whole year. Students have come to be with us who would never have come except to study under Father Feeney’s direction.

They have made great sacrifices to do this, and so have their families. We have ordered a good many things in the way of books, furniture and so on. We have our faculty for the year.

“Over and above all this, St. Benedict Center has a doctrinal policy and a policy with regard to secular education. Father Feeney has been opposed in both these policies, and his removal in this way will make it seem, beyond all doubt, that he has been teaching error. I am sure Father McEleney does not realize all the implications in this move. Father Feeney is a fine and holy priest, a great Jesuit, and this tears down his entire doctrine. It puts us all in very bad faith. What we desire is a fair hearing.”

Father Murray: “I am sure all this has been taken into consideration.”

Catherine Clarke: “But not with us.”

Father Murray: “But not with you? Why should it be discussed with you?”

Catherine Clarke: “Don't we have any rights in the matter?”

Father Murray: “I can't see that you do.”

Catherine Clarke: “But St. Benedict Center is a lay organization.”

Father Murray: “I don't see that that makes any difference.”

Catherine Clarke: “Then we are to have no hearing?”

Father Murray: “Answer me this: What would you do if Father Feeney died?”

Catherine Clarke: “Oh, we would know then that this was God's will.”

Father Murray: (Raising his eyebrows and growing even more difficult) “You mean it isn't God's will now?”

Catherine “To do this without a hearing is an injustice.

Clarke: God's will is not usually indicated in that way. Your bearing and attitude would make Father Feeney out a criminal. He is a very holy priest, as everyone who has worked with him at St. Benedict Center will testify."

Father Murray: "I know Father Feeney, and I am grateful to him for help he has given me, personally. But I have nothing to say about this change."

Catherine Clarke: "When may I see the Provincial, do you think?"

Father Murray: "The Provincial is a very busy man, with much more important things on his mind. This case is not the only thing the Provincial has to think about. He is going to Connecticut today, and will not be able to see you."

After Father Murray had indicated that the Provincial would not see Catherine Clarke, she left. (The whole interview with Father Murray was very unpleasant.) She then went to see Monsignor Hickey, who said that he could do nothing in the matter, even if he would, since the orders had come from Father's Provincial. The interview with Monsignor Hickey was equally unpleasant.

Fakhri Maluf called on Monsignor Hickey also, later in the same day, and pleaded for a hearing: "I know that if you were to hear the facts and know the consequences, your priestly heart would not let you take responsibility for this action."

Monsignor Hickey became extremely angry, and said, "I am not hearing anybody on this matter!" At which, Dr. Maluf left.

On the evening of August 26th, Catherine Clarke wrote to the Provincial a long letter, stating our reasons for desiring a hearing. On August 27th, she telephoned Loyola House, the Provincial's Commonwealth Avenue residence, and got Father Murray on the 'phone. He continued just as unpleasantly to tell her that the Provincial had received her letter, but still did not wish to see her.

The Provincial never answered the letter.

(copy)

First Telegram to Bishop Wright

WESTERN UNION

AUG. 26, 1948.

BISHOP JOHN WRIGHT
C/O AMERICAN EXPRESS
C/O "PILGRIMAGE"
NICE, FRANCE

UNDER MONSIGNOR HICKEY'S AUSPICES FATHER BEING TRANSFERRED. CENTER IS ABOUT TO CLOSE. ADVISE IMMEDIATELY WHAT WE SHOULD DO.

CATHERINE CLARKE

The following letter was delivered at Loyola House by: Fakhri Maluf, Daniel Sargent, Raymond Karam, David Supple, Howard Cannon, David Thomson, George Favreau, and Philip Gammans.

August 31, 1948.

Very Rev. John J. McEleney, S.J.
Provincial of the Society of Jesus in New England,
297 Commonwealth Ave.,
Boston, Massachusetts.

Dear Father Provincial,

We, the members and students of St. Benedict Center, request from Your Reverence an audience whereby a group representing us may present to you facts of the greatest importance concerning our work in the field which is so well known to us.

. . . We begged you at one time to allow us to have Father Leonard Feeney, of the Society of Jesus, to be our spiritual director, and you responded generously to our request. It would require a very large book to present a record of all the works accomplished by Father Feeney for the greater honor and glory of God, in his leadership of our group. But the point immediately relevant to the crisis in which we were placed during this last week is the fact that since on the Status

Day we were made to believe that Father Feeney was assigned to our work for another year, we made plans accordingly and have undertaken commitments of a very serious nature. Many of us, with no other desire than to learn our Catholic Faith in the pure, unadulterated, challenging form in which it is presented by Father Feeney, have left home and college and missed many opportunities, to avail ourselves of the instruction in Holy Scripture and in the Doctors of the Church under the inspiring guidance of Father Feeney.

But even this, grievous a matter as it is, and a question of strict justice, is not our principal concern, because this aspect of it is merely personal and entails our personal loss, albeit of the spiritual order. Our principal concern . . . is the bearing of Father Feeney's withdrawal from our work, at this time and in this manner, on the cause of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the environment in which we work. . . .

We still hope that you will graciously grant us an opportunity to present the facts to you. We believe that your conception of Catholic rule is in agreement with the great tradition of St. Ignatius, namely, one of paternal government and not one of tyranny. We believe that we, the persons who are most concerned in this matter, have the right of a hearing.

Yours sincerely in Christ,
Fakhri Maluf, Philip Gammans, David Supple, Daniel Sargent, George Favreau, David Thomson, Raymond Karam, Howard Cannon,
for St. Benedict Center.

We never received an acknowledgment or an answer to this letter.

Bishop Wright's answer to our first cable arrived about a week after our cable was sent. It must have been about September 2, 1948. It read approximately:

DEAR CATHERINE:

I AM SURE THAT THE PASTOR (MONSIGNOR HICKEY) AND THE PROVINCIAL (FATHER MCELENEY) WILL DO EVERYTHING

FOR THE INTERESTS OF THE CHURCH, THAT IS, OF CHRIST. WE HAVE HAD NO WORD OF IT OVER HERE EXCEPT YOUR CABLE.

JOHN WRIGHT

The names and brackets are his.

Second cablegram to Bishop Wright. We received no answer.

WESTERN UNION

BISHOP JOHN WRIGHT
C/O AMERICAN EXPRESS
C/O PILGRIMAGE
ROME, ITALY

BESEECH YOU FOR THE LOVE OF CHRIST TO CABLE AT ONCE TO MONSIGNOR HICKEY AND FATHER MCELENEY, JESUIT PROVINCIAL, TO STOP ALL ACTION AS REGARDS FATHER FEENEY AND ST. BENEDICT CENTER UNTIL YOU OR THE ARCHBISHOP RETURNS.

YOUR LOVING AND DEVOTED CHILDREN
OF ST. BENEDICT CENTER.

Cablegram to Archbishop Cushing, to which we received no answer:

MOST. REV. RICHARD J. CUSHING, D.D.,
C/O AMERICAN EXPRESS
C/O PILGRIMAGE
ROME, ITALY

I BESEECH YOU TO CABLE MONSIGNOR HICKEY AND MY PROVINCIAL TO HOLD UP MY REMOVAL FROM ST. BENEDICT CENTER UNTIL YOU RETURN AND MAKE THE INVESTIGATION YOU PROMISED. WE HAVE MOST SERIOUS FACTS TO PRESENT.

FAITHFULLY IN CHRIST,
LEONARD FEENEY, S.J.

On September 8th, the day Father Feeney was to leave St. Benedict Center, Fakhri Maluf, David Supple and Catherine Clarke set out, about four o'clock, to see Father Louis Gallagher, S.J., Father Feeney's rector, at St. Andrew House, 300 Newbury St., Boston. They arrived a few minutes after Father Gallagher had left. They then decided to try once again to see the Provincial, and so went over to his residence at Loyola House, on Commonwealth Avenue, a few streets over from Newbury Street. They were met at the door by one of the Brothers. He told them, one by one, that Father Provincial was out, Father Provincial's secretary, Father Murray, was out, the Assistant to the Provincial was out. The Center people said they would come in anyway, and wait for someone to come in, since it was very important. Brother showed them to the little room beside the chapel, and Brother then went into the office beyond the chapel, and telephoned to someone upstairs.

Then he came back and said, "They are not in, you are foolish to wait." The Center people said they would wait.

After twenty minutes and more telephoning upstairs, Brother came in and said, "It is no use your waiting; the Provincial won't see you."

Catherine Clarke: "We thought the Provincial was out?"
Brother: "He came in a few minutes ago, in the back door."
Catherine Clarke: "He came in the back door?"
Brother: "Yes, and he went up the back stairs."
David Supple: "Well, we'll wait until we see *somebody*."

After another long wait, Father Murray finally came down.

Father Murray: "There's no need of your seeing the Provincial. It won't do you any good at all."
Catherine Clarke: "We have a real need to see the Provincial. If he persists in not seeing us, he will be responsible for a great injustice and a scandal to the Order and to the Diocese."

Father Murray: "If you are going to wait here until you see somebody, you will have to wait a long time."
Fakhri Maluf: "We're prepared to wait a long time. We're prepared to wait until we see someone."

> Dr. Maluf and David Supple talked with Father Murray, told him that we had been accused of picketing the residence when, on August 31st, we had come as dignified men to see the Provincial, were refused an interview, and had gone away. This kind of high-handed tyranny and injustice was something which would shock all good Catholics. Whereupon Father Murray said something about obedience, and Fakhri and David said that we were a lay organization and not under obedience to the Jesuit Order, and right now we were interested not in obedience but in *justice*. Justice was the virtue which was being outraged. More followed, but at the end, with a very scornful air, Father Murray walked off, leaving the Center group sitting in the little room while the Jesuits received a guest, went down to dinner, had recreation. Finally, having been there several hours, they were compelled by time to leave. The office door had been opening and closing all during the long visit; Brother was telephoning upstairs constantly; but not once did the Provincial come down.

Indeed, never, at this time or in the months which followed, did Father McEleney, the Provincial of the Society of Jesus, ever speak to us, answer our letters, feel that we had any right to see him, to ask for a hearing, or that we should be treated in any way other than arbitrarily.

XIV

DOCTRINE or Discipline! St. Benedict Center knew, as far back as the fateful September 8, 1948, the day on which Father Leonard Feeney was to leave the Center and report for duty as a teacher of English at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Massachusetts (outside the diocese of Boston), that failure by Father to go to Holy Cross would constitute for our liberal superiors an opportunity to obscure the doctrinal challenge by making the whole thing appear to be disciplinary.

We considered this thoroughly in the bleak hours which followed our humiliating experience at the Provincial's house. We had come back to a Center blazing with candlelight and flowers, for it was the feast of the Nativity of Our Lady, but to Center members who were drawn-faced and anxious. They had been praying during the hours we were gone.

Father's two shabby black bags were packed and waiting beside the door, not to take him on a lecture tour this time, but for the trip to Worcester, and away from us, for good. The married members of the Center had brought their babies, early in the morning of that long day, and the children, sensing something very wrong, were crying steadily the fussy complaint of little ones at such times, a cry nerve-wracking and unending.

We joined Father and the men in Father's room, and weighed with them the problem of doctrine and discipline. Father Feeney was asked to leave the diocese because the truth he was teaching was embarrassing to too many people. The feeling of College Officials about the resignations of students from Harvard, the discomfiture of priests studying at Harvard, and social Catholics with Harvard connections—on the one hand—and, on the other, the hierarchical policy of expediency, had conspired to bring about Father's removal from St. Benedict Center. The Church in Boston was saying, not in words so much as in action, "Hush, hush! Father Feeney. This isn't the time to preach the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Church. There is a time for that, but this is not the time."

Not even with Christ saying through His Apostle, "Behold, *now* is the acceptable time. Behold, *now* is the day of salvation."?

No, not even then.

Our choice finally lay between two courses of action: (1) Father Feeney's remaining at St. Benedict Center—in which case the doctrine would be upheld and championed, even though to the world, to his friends as well as to his enemies, Father would appear as merely a disobedient priest, and St. Benedict's a center of recalcitrants. Or (2) Father would leave St. Benedict Center and go to Holy Cross—in which case the doctrine would be completely discredited and Liberal Catholicism more deeply entrenched than ever, with no challenge to it worth mentioning in the United States. With the first course there was, too, the hope of a hearing eventually, when Archbishop Cushing returned from Europe. With the second course Father Feeney's distinguished reputation as a Jesuit writer would be saved, and St. Benedict Center would enjoy its former esteem.

We chose the first course. We would so choose again. Despite the avalanche of prestige, power and politics which has been hurled upon us for over a year, despite the cry of "Discipline!" which has been made against our protest of "Doctrine!" people everywhere know that there is a group of Catholics who hold for the safeguarding of the Deposit of Faith in the way the Church has always protected the Faith for its children—by the unequivocal rendering of the defined doctrines of the Church. It were better that we should lose all we have than that the Truth should die.

We sent, on the following morning, a letter to the Provincial of the Jesuits:

September 9, 1948.

Very Rev. John J. McEleney, S.J.,
Provincial of the Society of Jesus,
297 Commonwealth Ave.,
Boston, Massachusetts.

Dear Father McEleney:—

Inasmuch as you have consistently and rudely refused us a hearing, we, the members and students of St. Benedict Center, wish to inform you that Father Leonard Feeney of the Society of Jesus has commitments towards us to be our director and instructor throughout this academic year. On the basis of Father Feeney's promise, we have made all our plans and undertaken very serious commitments. We have placed before Father Feeney's conscience the seriousness of his commitments to us, and the fact that he has no right under God's law to break his contract with us at this time.

We are hereby informing you that by our unanimous request Father Feeney will continue to lead our work until we get a fair hearing from higher authorities.

Respectfully yours,
The members and students of St. Benedict Center.
(There followed the signatures of many Center members.)

St. Benedict Center received no reply from the Jesuit Provincial, but Father found a letter from him in his mail-box the next day:

Provincial's Residence
297 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston 15, Massachusetts
Society of Jesus
Province of New England

September 10, 1948.

Dear Father Leonard, P.C.
For your own sake and for the Society's, I plead with you to end all connection with St. Benedict's Centre at once and to report to Holy Cross next Monday.

Further refusal to obey in this matter will only embarrass the Society and the Province and will detract from whatever good you have done at the Centre.

I therefore ask you, as your Major Superior, to follow the orders given you for the love you bear the Society and Almighty God.

Yours in Corde Jesu,
(signed) J. J. McEleney, S.J.

To which letter Father Feeney made reply:

September 12, 1948.

Reverend and dear Father Provincial,

In one last letter, I am asking you solemnly in the Sacrament of my Priesthood and the sanctity of my vow, to desist at once from endeavouring to remove me from St. Benedict Center and from Newbury Street, and to leave my appointment as of the Status you issued at the beginning of the summer.

If, as you told me, my removal is not of your doing but that of a higher authority, I demand that it be brought to the attention of that higher authority at once the nature of my protest as a priest. I realize fully the serious consequences to my immortal soul if there is, as you are said to have suspected, legal trickery or subterfuge.*

---

* Word had reached Father Feeney of a purported statement of the Provincial's, upon hearing that Father's reason for remaining at St. Benedict Center was one of conscience. Father McEleney was reported to have said, "Anyone can trump

> I shall prepare a full and detailed report of my serious conscience difficulties and the reasons why, for the glory of God, the good of the Society, and the salvation of hundreds of souls who are depending upon me in this terrible emergency in an heretical university in which I am presently placed, at the moment I cannot in conscience leave until I can do so with dignity and as their Father;—and I shall present this report to every one of my major superiors whom it may concern.
>
> Sincerely yours in the Society of Jesus,
> (signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

Father McEleney's answer to Father Feeney's letter of September 12th was a reiteration of his order that Father transfer to Holy Cross and terminate his work at St. Benedict Center. He refused to recognize Father's conscience difficulty by the statement:

> "The whole question at issue is your transference to Holy Cross and the termination of your work at St. Benedict Center."

And he made it entirely a matter of obedience:

> "Your priestly vows on the day of your Priesthood involve your promise of obedience to your Provincial whoever he may be through the years. As a Jesuit who is to excel in obedience even above many other virtues, the clear way Almighty God is pointing out to you is in accepting the orders I have given you. . . . Your own happiness in the vindication of all the apostolic zeal and devotion you have in your heart is involved in your filial acceptance of this decision."

We never could understand how it was possible for Father McEleney to think that the "vindication of Father's apostolic

---

up a conscience difficulty." This had shocked Father Feeney since it would be a violation of the sacred right of conscience. However, it is a fact that from this time on, Father's right of conscience in defending the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Church was consistently denied by everyone of his superiors in the Jesuit Order, right up to the General himself, as well as by the local Hierarchy.

zeal and devotion" could be had, as a priest, in the abandonment of doctrine! Especially when that doctrine had come so blazingly clear, not only to Father Feeney but to everyone in St. Benedict Center. There are some excellent minds in St. Benedict Center, people who have gained recognition for scholarship, not only in the United States but in various parts of the world.

As for Father Feeney's "own happiness"—yes, it was contained in the Society of Jesus. He had been a Jesuit for thirty-four years, at this time. His love for the Society, as he conceived the Society, had been the inspiration for all the boys he had sent to follow him in the Jesuit Order. We were always conscious of Father's devotion to the saints of his Order, and particularly to St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, St. Robert Bellarmine, St. Peter Canisius, the Japanese Jesuit martyrs.

Father had thought long on the results of his apparent disobedience on the lives of those closest to him. His beloved mother and father were very old, and had had serious illnesses. He had his two brothers to think of, each a priest, one in the Society of Jesus, and one a parish priest in New Hampshire. The children of his devoted sister, Eileen, were at an impressionable age.

Calvary did not, as far as anyone could see, bring about the happiness of Jesus; and the suffering Calvary caused His Mother is incomprehensible. Yet doctrine is the cause for which Jesus was crucified—the doctrine that He was the Son of God. St. Ignatius of Loyola told his sons that they were, in all things, to be the followers of Christ. They were the Company of Jesus.

St. Ignatius himself had come up before the Inquisition, on a matter of doctrine. Yes, it will be said, but St. Ignatius was correct in his doctrine. Granted, we answer, but he was before the Inquisition precisely because he was accused of error in doctrine. The Inquisition gave St. Ignatius a hearing on his doctrine—which is all that Father Feeney asked for. In this age of ours, which considers itself superior to an Inquisition, Father was denied what would have been his right in the sixteenth century—a hearing.

We turned, finally, to St. Thomas Aquinas for confirmation of what our consciences told us to be true. We found it in the *Summa Theologica,* Secunda Secundae, Question 104, Article 5, wherein St. Thomas distinguishes three kinds of obedience:

> "Accordingly we may distinguish a threefold obedience; one, sufficient for salvation, and consisting in obeying when one is bound to obey; secondly, perfect obedience, which obeys in all things lawful; thirdly, indiscreet obedience, which obeys even in matters unlawful. . . . .
> . . . . (Moreover), it is written (Acts V 29): 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' NOW SOMETIMES THE THINGS COMMANDED BY A SUPERIOR ARE AGAINST GOD. THEREFORE SUPERIORS ARE NOT TO BE OBEYED IN ALL THINGS."

May I say that it has been left to the reader in this chapter to fill in the story. It is not possible to tell how much it cost us all to enter upon this course. The early history of the Center will have indicated with what veneration we held the will of those God had constituted our lawful superiors. It cost us a very great deal to go against our tradition, our training, against the love we bore these superiors—not in their persons so much, for many of them were not lovable as persons, but because they were a necessary part of the Church we loved. We seemed to be going against the very thing which we were fighting to uphold—the authority of the Church. We had asked for nothing more than the peace to study in the school we had built, the quiet to contemplate, to know God more fully, and joyfully to bring His message to others. We found ourselves stopped, on our way, by the necessity to do battle for the doctrines of the Church, that the Faith might continue to exist at all. We found ourselves stopped before the revelation that the Liberalism we had come to know and dread had reached even to the highest places. Our superiors, every one of them, we now realized, were Liberal Catholics.

It is true we were tempted to belittle our stand by asking ourselves the question: Are *you* the only orthodox Catholics? Are you the only group in the United States who are holding the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church or without personal submission to the Holy Father?

Father Feeney answered for us: "We hope not. However, we take great courage from the fact that the great Catholic saint and Doctor of the Church, St. Athanasius, was exiled five times and excommunicated by *every* Bishop in the East for holding out alone for Catholic doctrine. The creed which bears his name, the Athanasian Creed, states, 'Whosoever wishes to be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith, which unless one preserves whole and inviolate without doubt he will perish eternally.'

"The great jurist and Chancellor of England, St. Thomas More, on trial for his life, was asked by the prosecutor, 'What, More? You wish to be considered wiser and of better conscience than all the bishops and nobles of the realm?' St. Thomas More replied: 'My lord, for one bishop of your opinion I have a hundred saints of mine; and for one parliament of yours, and God knows of what kind, I have all the general councils for a thousand years.' "

And so, under a cloud, St. Benedict Center entered upon a period of hidden struggle, which lasted for seven months. The courage, fortitude, strength for it were given to us by Her who is the Mediatrix of all Graces.

X V

THE letter which the members and students of St. Benedict Center wrote, on September 9, 1948, to the Provincial of the Society of Jesus, Father McEleney, was signed by as many members as were present in the Center at the time of its writing. Included in the signatures were the names of Fakhri Maluf, David Supple, James Walsh and Charles Ewaskio. It flashed across my mind at the time that the endorsement might conceivably cost them their teaching positions, but I dismissed the thought as petty and improbable. The Jesuits were an old teaching Order, and the men would be protected by their right of academic liberty.

This, however, did not prove to be the case. Dr. Maluf returned to Boston College for the year 1948-1949 to find that the head of the Philosophy Department, Father O'Brien, had been made President of Holy Cross College, and the new head of the Department, Father Duncan, seemed to have definite instructions with regard to the treatment of him and Mr. Walsh. Dr. Maluf had taught at Holy Cross College for three years, and the present academic year was his third at Boston College. For none of these years had he received a written contract. It had apparently been understood that he would go right on from one year to another.

In the fall of 1948, however, Dr. Maluf received the following letter from the Dean of Boston College:

Boston College
Chestnut Hill
Massachusetts.

September 24, 1948.

Dr. Fakhri Maluf,
24 DeWolfe St.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Dr. Maluf:

I invite you to continue as an Assistant Professor in the Philosophy Department. With the regular increment I understand that your salary will be $3800 for the ten month period from Sept. 1948 through June 1949.

If these terms are acceptable to you will you please reply in writing and include the terms proposed?

Sincerely in Christ,
(signed) Ernest B. Foley, S.J.
Dean

Dr. Maluf replied, accepting the appointment, wondering at the same time if perhaps this unusual procedure might have an implication of a change of policy with regard to him. He was carrying, along with this teaching schedule in the undergraduate school, classes in the Graduate School of the College of Arts and Sciences; in the Boston College Intown School; and in the Adult Education Institute of Boston College. Dr. Maluf tells the story of Father Duncan's policy with respect to his courses at Boston College:

> "When Father O'Brien was the head of the Philosophy Department, he asked me (last year) what I would think about a course in the history of philosophy. I told him I did not think that the students needed to get interested in the modern sophists who were deliberately evading and dodging the Christian challenge, but that a course on the development of Greek thought in the first term and of the Scholastic tradition in the second term might have its value. I found later that Father

O'Brien had taken my advice from the fact that a course with this exact description appeared in the catalogue of Boston College. Then I was told by Father O'Brien that I would teach the course.

"When Father Duncan took over as head of the Philosophy Department, he told me that the course on the history of philosophy was still in question, not sure to be given, and that he would let me know later whether I was to give the course or not. I came to know that the course was not placed on the mimeographed sheets from which the students make their selections—and very few students refer to the catalogue for that purpose.

"Just at the beginning of the term, Father Duncan finally said to me that no one had registered for the course, and therefore the course would not be given. A few hours later, while I was still on the campus, a student, Larry Azar, came to me and asked if I knew who was going to teach the course on the history of philosophy, and where and when it was to be given, because he had registered for it and there seemed to be no way of knowing anything further about it. Innocently, in full good faith, I told him that I was informed that no one had registered for the course, and if *he* had, he must have been the only one to do so. As I was talking, I saw Father Duncan in the distance, and I said to Larry: 'Why don't you go to Father Duncan? He is now the head of the Department.' He hurried on to Father Duncan, and I finally joined them. Father Duncan told Larry that not enough people had registered for the course, and that therefore they had decided not to give it. But he was evidently extremely disturbed that Larry was discussing the course with me, and he became even more so when I joined them. Later he told me that I should not put the students in bad faith, and that I was wrong in discussing the matter with Larry Azar and in sending him for further information to him. I had not the slightest idea about the cause of his most unnatural behaviour, and thought that he was naturally a very scrupulous and legalistic sort of person. And I tried to explain to him how innocent and coincidental the whole thing was."

In October, the following letter came:

College of the Holy Cross
Worcester 3, Massachusetts
Office of the President

Oct. 2, 1948.

Mr. Fakhri Maluf,
24 DeWolfe Street,
Cambridge, Mass.

Dear Fakhri:

Unofficial reports and rumors that have come to me here, have led me to think that the situation at the Center has reached a critical state. If that is so and if you and Jim Walsh would think it advisable, I would like to talk to you both about it.

I shall be away from here from Wednesday evening, October 6 until Friday noon, October 8. But, if you both are free and would be willing to discuss the matter with me, I could see you sometime Wednesday afternoon, October 6 or Friday afternoon, Oct. 8. Would it be possible for you both to come here at either of those times or if not, when would be a convenient time for me to see you?

Kind personal wishes to you and Mary and to Jim and his wife.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) John A. O'Brien, S.J.

To which, Fakhri answered:

90 Putnam Avenue,
Cambridge 38, Mass.

Rev. John A. O'Brien, S.J.,
President's Office,
College of the Holy Cross,
Worcester 3, Massachusetts.

Dear Father O'Brien:

We received your note only Wednesday evening, on account of the change in our address. Tomorrow (Friday) afternoon we have the first department meeting which both Jim and I must attend. The reports and rumors about the Center are greatly exaggerated. We have already gotten into an excellent start of a very promising year, and have been already blessed, through Our Lady's help, with many fruits. We are very grateful to you for your concern about the Center, and would be very happy to discuss it with you as soon as we can find our way to Worcester, or in case you find yourself in or around Boston and would honor us with a visit. In the meanwhile, there is no cause for any great concern.

I have not yet had the opportunity to congratulate you on your appointment to the presidency of Holy Cross. We are very, very lonesome for you at Boston College. We miss your leadership, your guidance, and your loyalty to the Catholic tradition of liberal education. We certainly promise you our continual prayers for success in your aims. Mary joins with me in the expression of our deepest regards and our gratitude.

Sincerely yours,
Fakhri Maluf

Dr. Maluf did not hear again from Father O'Brien, but he did receive, about a week later, a note from Father Duncan, asking him to report to his office, after class. Mr. Walsh found a similar request in his mail box. The conversation between Dr. Maluf and Father Duncan, when they met at the appointed time, was as follows:

Fr. Duncan: "I asked you to come to see me about a letter [p. 113] from St. Benedict Center to Father McEleney, the Provincial, which carries your signature. Father McEleney would like to know whether this was a demand or a presentation. I have not seen the letter, and the matter has not come up to me officially yet."

Dr. Maluf: "Father Duncan, is this in any way a threat that I may lose my position at Boston College on account of that letter?"

Fr. Duncan: "I am surprised that you should draw this inference. I am talking to you unofficially as a friend and not as your superior in the Philosophy Department."

Dr. Maluf: "I am surprised that you should be surprised that I drew that inference. And I don't believe that you have the right to discuss this matter with me except in your official capacity. We sent the letter to Father McEleney after he had refused us rudely any occasion to present our case to him. I don't see why Father McEleney, instead of meeting our just demands, should try to solve the problem of St. Benedict Center by threatening our means of livelihood. And why should he refuse to meet us on the issues? I consider that this is not government by justice, but tyranny, by threats and intimidations."

Fr. Duncan: "Of course, personally I know nothing about the issues and have never seen the letter. We are merely concerned here to know that our professors have due respect for authority."

Dr. Maluf: "I have been with you for three years, and before that I was three years at Holy Cross. You can find out from my superiors that in all this time I had respect for authority. But in this case I believe we had the full right at least to present our case. I did not believe that there was any ruler in the Church who would not be available to receive a Christian with a just grievance. I believe that Father McEleney's treatment of us was outrageous."

Father Duncan at this point said, "Supposing Father McEleney gives you and Father Feeney a hearing and then sends Father Feeney to Holy Cross all the same?"

Dr. Maluf: "I am shocked that you should make this remark so cynically. You are indicating that the facts we have to present would not receive a fair consideration. I know that we are working for the cause of our Holy Faith, and I know that we have a case worthy of being presented even to the Holy Father himself."

Fr. Duncan: "If you think that your letter to Father McEleney has made an impression which you did not intend, would you be willing to write him a letter explaining your real intentions?"

Dr. Maluf: "I must insist again, Father Duncan, on expressing my great resentment at the fact that you should be asked to discuss this matter with me in this manner. I believe that our two letters [and I here explained to Father Duncan that there were two letters, and not only one—which he did not know] to Father McEleney were clear and self-explanatory, and obviously I am willing to take responsibility for anything contained in them."

Fr. Duncan: "Again, I want to make sure that you realize that I am talking to you as a friend, and not in any official capacity."

Mr. Walsh's interview with Father Duncan followed upon Dr. Maluf's. Father Duncan said to Mr. Walsh:

> "The Provincial is very much concerned about a letter he has received from St. Benedict Center, on which your signature appeared. He does not know whether the tone of a demand designed to dictate to him what he should do, or is merely a strong representation. The situation is complicated, of course, by your being a member of the faculty of an institution under the authority of the Provincial, and in this regard he is concerned lest your signature on the letter be an indication of your general attitude to his authority.
>
> "I am bringing this to your attention as a friend," Father Duncan assured Mr. Walsh. "I am not speaking officially, and I have not seen the letter in question. There is, however, the possibility that at some time in the future the matter may come up officially, in which case it would be much more serious. If I were you, I would write to the Provincial, telling him exactly what you understood by the letter when you signed it."

Mr. Walsh: "I think that the intent of the letter was clearly contained in it, and I am prepared to take full responsibility for having signed it. I cannot remember the exact wording of it, but as I remember it in substance I don’t see how it could be misunderstood.”

Fr. Duncan: “Sometimes the cold, written words can be misleading. I would suggest that you reread it and perhaps you might find it stronger than you intended, and you might wish to clarify your position on that basis to the Provincial, or you might even find that you would wish to withdraw your signature completely.”

Mr. Walsh: “It has now been more than a month since that letter was sent to the Provincial, and I assure you that in view of the deliberation I have made since then, I would sign the same letter today were the opportunity to present itself.”

The interview was brought to a close. Both Dr. Maluf and Mr. Walsh came away from Father Duncan’s office with grave misgivings.

XVI

THE experience of Dr. Maluf and Mr. Walsh at Boston College, recorded in the last chapter, was but the beginning of a long period of pressure which was brought to bear upon all the members of St. Benedict Center. Our friends and supporters were constantly written to, or contacted in some way, in an effort by the authorities to separate us, either from Father, from the Center, or from the doctrine.

For example, our most steady source of income was taken from us at this time, in the fall of 1948, an income which had been most solemnly promised to us. It had come from an old member of the Center, from a man Father Feeney had sent to the Jesuit Order, one of the vocations for which the Provincial had thanked us. This support was now cut off from us by the Society of Jesus. That the Society of Jesus would do such a thing in clear violation of St. Ignatius' rule regarding the disposal of novices' property, did not shock us or disedify us too much. We knew by this time that Liberalism was well established in the Jesuit Order, and that what the modern Jesuits had in the United States was but a shell of the Faith, with the substance eaten away. The Boston Heresy Case could never have occurred, either from the side of the Jesuits or the Boston Catholic hierarchy, if doctrine had remained the central emphasis in Catholicism. This book is intended in no way to be a bitter statement of wrongs. It is, rather, a concrete portrayal of the condition to which Liberalism has reduced the Church in this day, and in Boston in particular. What we in St. Benedict Center have suffered is nothing in comparison with the joys and consolations which Our Lady has given us along with our griefs, terrible though some of these were.

We were stricken, therefore, not so much by the loss of the money taken away from us at this time as we were by the defection of the person who consented to break his promise in such a way. He would, of course, offer the excuse that he had acted under obedience. But no one knew the limitations of obedience better than he. He had discussed it often, in the past, and obedience he well knew to be, not an end in itself, but the means to an end. Obedience for its own sake, obedience as an absolute, obedience at the expense of other central values, he knew to be thoroughly wrong.

Father Feeney was asked with regard to our apparent disobedience: "But aren't Jesuits supposed to be obedient?" He had answered, "Yes, but St. Ignatius was very definite on the subject of obedience. He did not indicate that in any case could observance of discipline prevail over loyalty to dogma. Should that be true, I should have to say that Jesuit obedience is sheer conformity performance, for which the Nazis can be as much admired as the Jesuits. It was this kind of obedience, this mistaken kind of obedience, that led H. L. Mencken to snigger at the Jesuits when they were accused of not being thinkers. 'The Jesuits are not supposed to be thinkers,' he said, 'they are supposed to be soldiers, and when soldiers start to think, the war is over.' "

Despite all this, we had some periods of calm at the Center, before the storm broke in all its fury in April. These were times when we went on with our work of study and research. Tuesday and Thursday evenings were as popular as ever. Rumor and gossip of St. Benedict Center were deliberately spread around the city, and reached our ears every so often, but very little harm, as far as we could see, was done to our work. Father made several conversions in the fall. The September HOUSETOPS came out (in October), with very little repercussion. Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright returned from Europe, and gave no indication to us that they had received our later cablegrams in Rome. They communicated with us not at all. They set about a round of Inter-faith activities before which their earlier efforts in that field were as nothing.

St. Benedict Center's policy with regard to Inter-faith follows of necessity from its adherence to the defined doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Church. For a Catholic to encourage his fellow-man to think that there are numerous ways of getting to heaven is, to our way of thinking, dishonest. We have no quarrel with Protestants and Jews getting together to discuss religion; that is none of our affair. But we feel that Catholics have no right to be there. There are legitimate ways for Catholics, in their everyday association with Protestants and Jews, to express personal friendliness, one to the other, in a social way. To enter the religious field for this purpose is to compromise the Faith, to dilute it, on the one hand, and to mislead people on the other. It is to pull the Faith down from its position as the perfect service of God, and to make it serve the social, political, economic ends of Liberal Catholicism.

Father Feeney describes an Inter-faith meeting as: "A place where a Jewish rabbi, who does not believe in the divinity of Christ, and a Protestant minister who doubts it, get together with a Catholic Priest, who agrees to forget it for the evening."

Propaganda has been put forth in the newspapers, motion pictures, radio and television on the subject of tolerance to such an extent that it amounts now to a species of tyranny. A point has been reached where most people are afraid to raise their voices even to qualify, at least, the false concept which has been forced upon the unthinking. Requirements are made of tolerance which would, in the name of sheer sanity, be violently rebuffed in other fields.

For instance, tolerance in bridge building, when lack of strict following of the fundamental rules would bring about the collapse of the bridge, would be considered insane. Tolerance in medicine, neglect of the basic precepts, with consequent death to the patient, would not be permitted for a moment. The theory "one way is as good as another" with regard to any other certitude which guarantees the safety of life, and which is protected by the "dogmas" into which its principles have been thrown, few as they may be, but none the less sure, would be termed suicide.

Early in October, 1948, under the direction of Bishop John Wright, the Spiritual Director of the League of Catholic Women, an invitation went out to all the women of the League to attend an Institute on Judaism, to be held on October 27th at Temple Ohabei Shalom, in Brookline. The Invitation was sent out from the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Committee on Interfaith Activities, and the purpose of the organization is clearly and honestly announced: To Build the House of Living Judaism. We had much more respect for Mrs. Robert Levi, the President of the Temple Sisterhood, who sent out the invitation, than we had for Bishop John Wright, who ruled that it be accepted by as many Catholic women as possible. The Pharisees of the Old Testament, whose refusal to intermix with religious sects had kept the old Jewish Faith pure and uncompromised before the coming of Christ, might not have agreed with Mrs. Levi, but at least her cause is directly stated with regard to her religion, and that a Jew should work to build Judaism was something we could understand. But our Liberal and politic Bishop we could not understand.

And so October and November passed. In November, Bishop Wright attended dinner at Lowell House.

In November, Dr. Maluf received another notice from Father Duncan, his department head at Boston College. Father Duncan discussed with him a few non-consequential matters, and just as Dr. Maluf was about to leave, Father Duncan said: "Oh, by the way, that question about the letter of St. Benedict Center to Father McEleney has come up officially, and I think Father Rector would like to discuss it with you. He might send you a notice to come to his office, but I would advise you to go to see him first on your own."

"Thank you very much for delivering this information", Dr. Maluf answered. He decided not to go to see Father Rector, but to wait for his notice. ("Father Rector" is the name by which the President of Boston College is known to the staff and members of the College.)

The notice came, a week or so later, and Dr. Maluf reported for the interview with Father William L. Keleher, S.J., President of Boston College, on December 2nd. The discussion was as follows:

Father Keleher: "Dr. Maluf, I have been anxious to meet you for a long time, and get to know you better. Due to the excessive business of my office, I never had the chance to do it. The occasion for my calling you today is the question of St. Benedict Center, which is getting to be a matter of great concern to the authorities here. This measure, you see, did not proceed from Father McEleney, but from the Bishop, and we are very anxious to keep in harmony with the diocesan authorities."

Dr. Maluf: "Do you mean Bishop Wright?"

Father Keleher: "I mean even the Archbishop."

Dr. Maluf: "But the ultimate origin of this order did not proceed from the Bishop or the Archbishop."

Father Keleher: "From whom, then?"

Dr. Maluf: "It is fairly common knowledge at Harvard that certain people connected with Harvard were dissatisfied with the Center."

Father Keleher: "Do you think that the Bishop and the Archbishop are likely to be influenced by people coming to them with such a demand?"

Dr. Maluf: "They do not have to come to the Bishop and the Archbishop. Archbishop Cushing had dinner at Lowell House in the spring, and Bishop Wright had dinner there just two or three nights ago." (President Keleher himself was eventually to be a dinner guest at Lowell House. On the evening of Nov. 7, 1949, ten days after the dismissal of Father Feeney from the Jesuit Order had been achieved, President Keleher attended High Table, seated at the right-hand of the Master of Lowell House.)

Father Keleher: "Then you think that there are politics behind this measure?"

Dr. Maluf: "I have no doubt whatsoever about it."

Father Keleher: "Do you think that Father Feeney's stand is serving the interests of the Church?"

Dr. Maluf: "Yes. And the fruits of St. Benedict Center's work are the proof." Dr. Maluf gave Father Keleher at this point a detailed report of the work of St. Benedict Center, and he added, "All this was achieved against handicaps and hardships and persecutions not merely from those on the outside, but from people within the Church."

Father Keleher: "I have the highest respect for Father Feeney, and I have always been edified by his exemplary life and that of his brother, Father Tom. And I believe that the work of St. Benedict Center is the work of God. It has given to our Order not merely in quantity a large number of vocations, but some vocations of whom the whole Jesuit Order is extremely proud."

Dr. Maluf: "Father Keleher, I believe that it is a very great grace to you as a priest that you should know the holiness of Father Feeney, and the nature of the work at St. Benedict Center. And I think that this grace imposes on you the duty to defend and support what you know to be God's work. I assure you that the Center is capable of doing for the glory of God far more when it receives official support in place of the present persecution."

Father Keleher: "Father Feeney came to me at the beginning of this situation, and I would have liked to do something except that I could not agree with his doctrine on salvation. When he was here talking with me I tried to get his answer to this question, but he went on talking without giving me a satisfactory answer. He kept repeating such phrases as 'There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church.' "

Dr. Maluf: "The doctrine that there is no salvation outside the Church is a defined dogma."

Father Keleher: "I have never gone into the theology of it, but I know that not merely our department of Religion here at Boston College, but also the theologians of St. John's Seminary and Weston College disagree with Father Feeney's doctrine on the salvation of non-Catholics."

Dr. Maluf: "We know that, and we are very anxious to fight the doctrinal issue with those who disagree with what we consider to be the defined doctrine of the Church. We have challenged them to fight the doctrinal issue with us, but they refuse to meet us on the matter of doctrine, and instead they maneuver to destroy our work by reducing the issue to one of discipline."

Father Keleher: "But nobody is trying to destroy the work of St. Benedict Center. And the stay of Father Feneey there is becoming a scandalous matter."

Dr. Maluf: "The removal of Father Feeney is, to everybody's understanding who is in any way concerned, a disavowal of his doctrine. Should Father Feeney give up the doctrine, *that* would be the scandal.

As a matter of fact, I don't know anybody who is scandalized by Father Feeney, except pharisaically. But I do know that many people are scandalized to see priests sitting in the classes of atheists, apostate priests, agnostics, listening to blasphemies with placid faces; and who come out of these classes having offered no protest against what they heard, not roaring like lions, but walking softly, sanctimoniously, as if they had been enjoying a holy vision. I think the people are more scandalized by our priests who are not teaching the complete Catholic truth, persecuting those who are."

Father Keleher: "Do you imply that we are not teaching the complete Catholic truth here?"

Dr. Maluf: "I do not know that you are teaching that there is no salvation outside the Church."

Father Keleher: "I can see great danger in the kind of personal devotion that you at St. Benedict Center seem to have for Father Feeney. You should be for the Priesthood and not for any particular priest."

Dr. Maluf: "I am sorry, Father, but I cannot agree with you on this doctrine of loyalty. Every priest in this country could stand for the complete Catholic Faith if he knew that he could get personal support from his children. On the other hand, however, if the kind of treatment Father Feeney is receiving were to be accepted as proper, no priest would dare to do or say anything that would be courageous."

Father Keleher: "What makes you think that the priest who is going to take Father Feeney's place is not going to teach you the full Catholic truth?"

Dr. Maluf: "We know that Father Feeney is teaching us the Catholic truth in the manner that sounds like a fitting echo of the voice of the Church officially pronouncing and defining, through its Popes, its Councils, and its Doctors. It has not come to my knowledge that any other priest in this neighborhood is thundering the Catholic truth with this clarity. I don't see why, if any priest is anxious to get to St. Benedict Center in order to profess the Catholic truth with Father's strength, he has not first been doing it where he is now. Besides, if Father Feeney can be removed for telling the truth, any priest who intends to do what Father Feeney is doing for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, can expect the same treatment that Father Feeney is getting."

Father Keleher: "But I don't think you realize sufficiently the traditions both of the Jesuit Order and of this diocese. The Jesuit Order is based on the vow of obedience, and this diocese—even before the present regime—has had a tradition of extremely rigorous discipline. For example, under Cardinal O'Connell, one of the greatest men we ever had here at Boston College, Father Thomas I. Gasson, to whom we owe everything here at the Heights, by falling into disfavor with the Cardinal, was ordered out of the Province. He spent his last days teaching grammar, somewhere in Canada."

Dr. Maluf: "But, Father, did that—or did all these things—redound to the greater honor and glory of God? Do you think it was Father McEleney's kind of legalistic obedience which sent St. Francis Xavier to the Indies? And is it not right for those who love God, and have zeal for His honor, to withstand injustice and tyranny? Do you think that God could leave His servants so fatalistically helpless? Father, I cannot understand how a priest can know all that you know and not feel called upon to do something about it. It is very clear that a new policy, new methods, fresh realization of the Faith, and a return to the order of the virtues, as understood and interpreted by the lives of St. Ignatius and the great saints of the Jesuit Order, is needed if we are to protect our children from what is coming."

Father Keleher: "Let us both pray that this situation will come to a conclusion in accordance with the will of God."

Dr. Maluf asked for and received Father Keleher's blessing, and the interview was ended.

Now, Mr. Walsh had also had a second talk with Father Duncan, in the middle of November. He met Father Duncan in the corridor of the Tower Building at Boston College, and Father Duncan said, "The matter about which I spoke to you has come up officially. The Rector is preparing to call you in to see him about it. If I were you, I would go to him first."

Mr. Walsh's only reply was, "Thank you, Father." And a week or so later Mr. Walsh received a note from the President of Boston College, Father Keleher, requesting him to come to the Rector's Office. Father Keleher received him, and told him that he had sent for him with regard to the letter which he had signed, addressed to the Provincial, which protested the removal of Father Feeney from St. Benedict Center.

Father Keleher: "Did you understand this letter to be a demand or merely a strong representation?"

Mr. Walsh: "The letter was written after every manner of attempt personally to see and talk with the Provincial had been snubbed by him even to the extent of keeping waiting for long periods of time those who went to see him, and finally refusing them an interview. In view of these consummate discourtesies, and of his completely unjust treatment of Father Feeney, the letter was written as a very strong protest. It's a very sorry state of affairs when the Provincial of a great Order treats people in this way. On one occasion when several people had waited a couple of hours to see him, one of the Jesuit Brothers came out and told them that the Provincial had come in the back door and wouldn't see them."

Father Keleher: "I don't understand the Provincial's actions in not seeing people. That was unfortunate."

The conversation then turned to Father Feeney.

Father Keleher: "Father Feeney is scandalizing many people by his disobedience."

Mr. Walsh: "Father, I know of many who would have been scandalized had he done otherwise. Many are scandalized because they want to be, and if anyone were to worry about whom he would scandalize, all he would do is develop a fine case of scruples."

Father Keleher: "Yes, that's true." Then Father Keleher said, "I have had and still have a great admiration for Father Feeney."

This led to Mr. Walsh's describing in some detail the vocations and conversions directly attributable to Father Feeney since he had been at St. Benedict Center. He spoke of the devotion of the boys and girls who attend school there, and he asked Father Keleher whether or not, judged by these fruits, St. Benedict Center was a work of God.

Father Keleher: "It certainly is a work of God."

Mr. Walsh: "Then certainly this work should continue. You are in a position to aid it greatly by supporting Father Feeney now, and I ask you to do just that."

Father Keleher: "I cannot do that because Father Feeney has refused to obey his superior. He has gone back on his vow of obedience by which he surrendered his free will to his superiors."

Mr. Walsh: "I certainly never heard of such an interpretation of the vow of obedience! Certainly no man could make that vow in such a way that he could violate his conscience. Father Feeney's action was

> taken as a matter of conscience, and was so presented to the Provincial, who, it is said, remarked, ‘Oh, anyone can say that!’ ”

Mr. Walsh told Father Keleher of his personal devotion and loyalty to Father Feeney.

Father Keleher: “You should not have that kind of loyalty to an individual priest, but to the priesthood.”

Mr. Walsh: “There is no priesthood apart from this or that individual priest.”

Father Keleher: “This kind of loyalty has resulted in schisms in our own archdiocese, when some predominantly German parishes refused to accept non-German priests.”

Mr. Walsh: “That bears no similarity to the present case. Father Feeney’s own loyalty to the Pope and our instruction by him on this point would not countenance such a thing.”

Father Keleher: “What is the status of St. Benedict Center?”

Mr. Walsh: “It is a lay organization.”

Father Keleher: “Under whose jurisdiction was it established?”

Mr. Walsh: “Our Holy Father, the Pope’s.”

Father Keleher: “*What?* I have never heard of an institution of that kind in this country. I know that it has sometimes happened in Europe.”

Mr. Walsh: “We have a document to that effect.”

Father Keleher: “Will you bring me a copy of it?”

Mr. Walsh said he thought he could bring Father Keleher a copy of the statement of our status by the Holy Father, and the interview ended.

XVII

FATHER FEENEY received, on December 6th, another letter from Father McEleney, repeating his instructions with regard to Father's transfer to Holy Cross, and making no mention of Father Feeney's conscience difficulty, or his request for a hearing. Father Feeney replied to this latest letter of the Provincial, on December 7th, saying: ". . . As you very well know, and as I wrote to you in the role of my Father Provincial, my unwillingness to leave St. Benedict Center and my home at the Jesuit House on Newbury Street is a matter of conscience with me, the details of which you do not have the willingness to receive."

Despite this, however, Father received from Father McEleney, on December 29th, the following communication:

Provincial's Residence
297 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston 15, Massachusetts

December 29, 1948.

Reverend Leonard Feeney, S.J.,
300 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass.

Dear Father Feeney, P.C.

Father William E. FitzGerald, the former Rector of Portland, is ready to take over the care of St. Benedict Center. He has the approval of diocesan authorities for this work. I would

> ask you to arrange for Father FitzGerald to do so. He is resident here at Loyola House at the present time and you would be welcome to see him here or plan to have him see you at 300 Newbury St.
>
> The longer this change is delayed the more seriously is the position of the Society in this Province injured. Prescinding from any personal considerations you may entertain with regard to myself, you will agree, I think, that the general good of the Province and of the Society which I know you love will suggest the course of action I am directing.
>
> Another reason is this. With the end of the calendar year your diocesan faculties will cease. I have not judged it expedient to present your name to the Chancery for a renewal of your faculties.
>
> In the appointment of Father FitzGerald, you will realize that a very capable Jesuit is being assigned to the work of the Center and that this work will not suffer under his care.
>
> Assuring you of my prayerful good wishes for God's blessing during the New Year, I remain,
>
> Yours in Corde Jesu,
> J. J. McEleney, S.J.

The threat to Father of the loss of his faculties was a very serious one, especially in view of the fact that Father held most sacredly his trust as spiritual director of souls, and had some serious conscience problems which he could not, without harm, abandon. Father McEleney did not tell Father Feeney that his faculties were removed. Were he to do that he would have to give some reason by way of serious fault in the matter of hearing confessions. He simply told him that his faculties were *not going to be renewed.*

Father Feeney went at once to his local superior, and pleaded for a delay in censuring him in this regard until his cause could be heard by the Assistant to the General of the Jesuits. The Assistant had already been in correspondence with Father, and eventually told him he could stay in Boston until he, the Assistant, arrived there. Father's local superior, Father Louis

J. Gallagher, S.J., of Newbury Street, had been kind enough not to ask Father to leave his room at St. Andrew House, nor to stop Father's saying Mass at his altar every morning at seven o'clock, despite the fact that Father McEleney had urged him to do so. Father Gallagher now told Father Feeney that Father McEleney and Monsignor Furlong had an understanding on the matter. If Father Feeney applied for a renewal of his faculties, Monsignor Furlong, the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, would not even listen to a reason why they should be extended.

Father Feeney then consulted an assured authority on Canon Law to discover from him how his faculties could be protected until his cause was heard and the accusations which he was prepared to make against the teachings of the Jesuit Order could be listened to. This very kind authority indicated to Father Feeney just how his faculties to hear confessions could be temporarily protected.

The story of St. Benedict Center and the Jesuit, Father FitzGerald, who, still without any consultation with St. Benedict Center, was assigned to direct the Center, is an amazing one. Many weeks before, we had been told by Boston College students attending Father's Thursday evening lecture, that they had been discussing Father Feeney's successor with fellow-students at the College, who came from Portland, Maine.

"The Rector of our prep school told us that he is being transferred from Portland", one of the Maine boys was reported to have said. "He told us that he is being sent to St. Benedict Center in Cambridge, 'to take care of those radicals'. His name's Father FitzGerald."

We dismissed the matter as rumor, inasmuch as we had written Father McEleney that St. Benedict Center, because of his treatment of Father Feeney and of us, would ask for no other priest from the Jesuit Order. We could scarcely believe the evidence of our eyes when we saw Father McEleney's letter of December 29th. Not only had he again ignored Father's repeated statement of his conscience difficulty and his plea for a hearing on it, but, not bending even now to communicate with us, he informed Father Feeney that a Jesuit director was on his way to us, in spite of our expressed wish not to have one!

To make the matter still more farcical, Father William FitzGerald, whom Father McEleney knew was not at the Center, was put down in the Jesuit catalogue as working at St. Benedict Center for the year. This gave Father FitzGerald a complete year's rest.

We began to wonder if pride were the distinguishing feature now of men in high places, and if all simplicity and humility had gone from them in their dealings with those under them. A cold, military obedience, not for the glory of God but for the perfect discipline of the organization, was what was required, apparently. At the beginning of the controversy we had been full of trust in our superiors. They gave us, in return, no fatherly, or even friendly consideration—in fact, no consideration at all. In the course of the months we wrote many letters, asking to see them, begging them to come to see us. Father Feeney pleaded with them, one after the other, to come, even for a few moments, to see us, to listen to what we had to say. Monsignor Hickey made two official visits merely to deliver some ultimatum, but no one ever came to talk with us.

Father Feeney could not in conscience as a priest comply with Father McEleney's tyrannical order to turn us over to Father FitzGerald, even aside from our feelings on the matter. Nor could he turn us over to any priest who would endeavor to teach us the exact opposite of the doctrine we knew to be true, and for which we had already suffered and sacrificed so much. To do so would have been to outrage every concept of right and wrong we had been taught as Catholics, and to surrender to a regime of tyranny comparable, in its way, to anything which worldly leaders of the day, Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, had tried to perpetrate on the people.

In the meantime, the December issue of the HOUSETOPS was published, and came out just before Christmas. It was notable because it contained Mr. Raymond Karam's first article on salvation, entitled, "Liberal Theology and Salvation".

Mr. Karam had resigned from Harvard College because he could not obtain there the courses he had hoped to study when he came to America, after making a distinguished record in scholarship at the American University of Beirut. He transferred to Boston College, to the Graduate School of Philosophy, and there, oddly enough, his disillusionment was complete. The course which most disturbed him was one on Modern Science and Philosophy, given by Father Joseph P. Kelly, S.J. Mr. Karam recorded in the Center Log at this time some of Father Kelly's statements. The following were recorded in December, 1948:

> "It is possible for any man to be saved outside the Catholic Church."
>
> "Any man who would say that there is no salvation outside the Church is a heretic."
>
> "If you say that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, you are a heretic and cannot save your soul."
>
> "The Catholic Church never defined or even suggested that there is no salvation outside it. No Pope, no Council, no Doctor of the Church ever taught that no one can be saved outside the Catholic Church."
>
> "Not only is it possible to be saved outside the Catholic Church, it is even possible to be saved while being an enemy of the Church and actively fighting against it."
>
> "St. Paul was not sinning while persecuting Christ and His Church."
>
> "The dogma that there is no salvation outside the Church (when Mr. Karam pointed out to Father Kelly that it was a defined dogma) applies exclusively to Catholics who have personally left the Church."

> "When a Pope or Council defines, or when a Doctor of the Church says that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, the meaning of this statement depends on what is meant by *the Catholic Church*."
>
> When Mr. Karam read the definition of the Council of Florence on salvation to Father Kelly, even in the clear words of the definition, Father Kelly still maintained that "the words do not mean that no man who dies outside of the Catholic Church—even if he is fighting against it!—can save his soul."
>
> "Baptism is not necessary for salvation."
>
> "Many people who are totally ignorant of Christ and His Church can be saved because their ignorance excuses them and confers on them baptism of desire."
>
> "A person can have baptism of desire, even if he is ignorant of the baptism of water, even if he refuses to be baptized by water."

The teaching of Father Kelly was something else we found hard to believe in the Jesuit Order. Mr. Karam dropped Father Kelly's course in the second semester, and in February he resigned from Boston College.

In a diocese where Liberal Catholicism is the order of the day, the article "Liberal Theology and Salvation" created a great stir. It was decided at last to answer us, in print, but before that was done, a subsequent reply by us must be prevented, and so, on January 17th, 1949, Monsignor Hickey, with one of his curates, came to St. Benedict Center. He served, orally, a notice to Father Feeney, that the magazine FROM THE HOUSETOPS was suspended by order "from the Chancery Office, and therefore from the Archbishop". After we had thought the order over for several minutes, Dr. Maluf went over to the Rectory, to which Monsignor Hickey had returned immediately after delivering his message to Father Feeney.

"Monsignor," said Dr. Maluf, "I have come to ask you to send us the order with respect to the HOUSETOPS in writing."

"I will see about that", Monsignor Hickey replied. And then, as Dr. Maluf stood up to leave, he said, "So you don't trust my word?"

"We would like to receive this order officially, and in documentary form, because we intend to appeal it to the Holy Office."

"If I were you, I wouldn't try that", Monsignor answered.

"I don't think we will take your advice here, Monsignor", Dr. Maluf said. "We know we are fighting a battle for the preservation of the Faith, and we know that the final judgment of our Holy Church cannot let us down."

St. Benedict Center did not receive in writing the order for the suspension of FROM THE HOUSETOPS.

On January 29, 1949, under the heading of the Department of Theology, Boston College, an article by Father Philip Donnelly, S.J., "Some Observations on the Question of Salvation Outside the Church", was brought out. It was written at first, so we were told, for the members of the faculty of Boston College, but before a few months had passed, copies of it were everywhere. They came to us through the mail; they were left in the Center chairs on Thursday night; we were called to the telephone and it was read to us over the wire.

Raymond Karam in his now famous "Reply to a Liberal" answered Father Donnelly's article, in the Spring issue of FROM THE HOUSETOPS. There will be occasion to refer to Mr. Karam's article again. We found it extremely difficult to believe that Father Donnelly considered his paper in any way an answer to the documents of the Popes, Fathers, Doctors and Councils, of which was comprised the article "Liberal Theology and Salvation".

The second term had begun, by this time, at Boston College. Before the first meeting of the Philosophy Department in the fall, Father Duncan had requested Dr. Maluf to submit a syllabus for each of his graduate courses. A week before the opening of the second term, Father Duncan requested an additional syllabus on Dr. Maluf's course on St. Thomas. Dr. Maluf complied with this request at once. He was, then, very much surprised when, on the evening before the first meeting of the course, Father Duncan telephoned him at his home, and said, "Is it possible for you to prepare a different course for the Graduate School than the course on St. Thomas?" Dr. Maluf replied,

"You know, Father, that a graduate course cannot be prepared over night. This course is advertised in the catalogue and has already been given several times at the College."

Father Duncan: "Higher authorities of the College are objecting to your giving this course, and wish it to be suspended."

Dr. Maluf: "For what reason?"

Father Duncan: "No reasons were to be given."

Dr. Maluf: "I am sorry, I cannot prepare another course."

Father Duncan: "I will consult with them again, and I will call you back in half an hour and tell you whether the course can be given or not." In exactly half an hour, Father Duncan telephoned, and said: "Will you promise not to discuss Grace in the course and restrict yourself merely to the discussion of natural bodies?"

Dr. Maluf: "You have the syllabus of the course, and as far as I remember, there is no question of Grace included."

Father Duncan: "The course will not be given unless you promise you will not discuss Grace."

Dr. Maluf: "Father Duncan, if you are implying that my doctrine on Grace is heretical, you as a priest are bound in conscience to tell me wherein it is wrong."

Father Duncan: "I am not interested in that. Can I understand that you promise not to discuss Grace?"

Dr. Maluf: "At this moment, and without consulting my notes for the course, I can only repeat that my syllabus does not include the question of Grace. Is that all you want to know?"

Father Duncan: "Yes."

Later in the evening, it occurred to Dr. Maluf that it was impossible to give, even ambiguously, the impression of a promise not to discuss Grace, and what belongs to the order of Grace, in a course on the *Summa Theologica.* He therefore left a message with Father McCarthy, of the Philosophy Department, that it was impossible for him to promise not to discuss Grace or the things that belong to the order of Grace in the *Summa.* He went to College for his first class in the course the next morning.

Sometime during the next week, Dr. Maluf received another notice from Father Duncan, asking him to come to see him in the Philosophy Office. This interview was very brief.

"Before you say anything," Dr. Maluf said, "I would like to make a few points clear. I understand that rumors have been all over the campus for weeks that my *Summa* course was not to be given, and that many people were dissuaded from taking the course by you. A day or so ago I heard from an old student of mine in New York that I was ordered not to teach a dangerous doctrine of mine on Grace. I am sick and tired of the way you have been hounding and persecuting me this year. You have done everything to try to break me. This is not merely an offense against charity—it is a sin against justice! Your pretense that you are worried about my doctrine on Grace is sheer hypocrisy when you are sending students to Professor Wolfson and Professor Wild, at Harvard. I know that your reason for doing this is that you are teaching heresy. You can see that I am in no mood to discuss anything with you. If you have any directions, send them to me by mail."

Father O'Donnell, the Dean of the Graduate School, then requested Dr. Maluf to come to his office. Dr. Maluf went, at once. The conversation was as follows:

Father O'Donnell: "I don't wish to enter as a mediator between you and Father Duncan, but I can't allow a course which the head of the department does not approve."

Dr. Maluf: "I have been giving this course in the Graduate School over many years, with the full approval of Father O'Brien. I still don't know that any of my doctrines is in question, or if so, which one is in question. Father Duncan has been methodically persecuting me this year, and he does not meet me on the issues. In all his contacts with me he has been cruel and evasive. His last measure in connection with my course on St. Thomas Aquinas is arbitrary and extreme. I want him to take full responsibility for his measure, and therefore I have asked him this time to put his order in writing."

Father O'Donnell: "Why don't you go and see him and settle this matter with him? I know nothing about the issues."

Dr. Maluf: "If he wants to see me in order to ask me again to promise not to discuss Grace, then I will give him the answer through you. I cannot give that promise."

Father O'Donnell: "Therefore, your graduate course in St. Thomas is suspended."

Dr. Maluf received a letter the following day from Father O'Donnell, dismissing him from the Graduate School.

The doctrine of Grace is intimately connected with the doctrine of No Salvation Outside the Church, and while neither Father Duncan nor Father O'Donnell had discussed this relation to the St. Benedict Center controversy, Dr. Maluf knew it was at the bottom of the whole matter. He wrote a note to

Father O'Donnell, and when he did not receive an answer, he went again to Father O'Donnell's office to see him.

Dr. Maluf: "So you have fired me from the Graduate School, Father? May I ask by what principle you have taken this action after my years of faithful service?"

Father O'Donnell: "I know nothing about the issues, and you know that I think the world of you, Fakhri, but I can't let you teach in the Graduate School if you will not even discuss your course with the head of the department."

Dr. Maluf: "I never told you that I would not discuss the course with the head of the department. I merely told you what I told Father Duncan, that I would like to receive his order in writing because I consider it an unreasonable order, and I would like him to take responsibility for it. Now, Father, I would like to know for what reasons you take an even more extreme measure and fire me from the Graduate School. I would like to know what is your conception of the rights and dignities of a professor in the Graduate School?"

Father O'Donnell: "I am going to be frank with you, Fakhri. You are teaching a doctrine which is not in agreement with the doctrine of the majority of theologians at the present time in this area. I have the highest respect for your zeal and integrity, but I advise you that if you persist you will not have a chance of teaching anywhere in this whole area. I have not gone into the theology of it, but I know that the theologians of St. John's Seminary and Weston College disagree with you."

Dr. Maluf: "I am teaching the doctrine of St. Thomas and St. Augustine. I know that I am teaching what our Holy Mother the Church teaches."

Father O’Donnell: “Well, that’s your opinion.”

Dr. Maluf: “Do you consider the issue falls in the area of legitimate opinion? If so, why can’t I have the right to teach what you are calling my opinion of what our Holy Mother the Church holds, even when it is not ‘in agreement with the opinion of the majority of theologians in this area’?”

Father O’Donnell: “It is very strange that the first time that the question of academic liberty arises here we should be to the ‘left’ against an extremely ‘right’ position!”

Dr. Maluf: “I am not merely surprised, Father. I am shocked to the depth of my being. I am positively scandalized that instead of upholding the Faith, as you are supposed and meant to do, you are persecuting those who profess it.”

In the middle of January, the President of Boston College, Father Keleher, sent again for Mr. Walsh. At this second meeting, Father Keleher reminded Mr. Walsh that he had not brought to him a copy of the document containing the status of St. Benedict Center. He said that the Archbishop was very interested to see it.

“I think it would be more appropriate if you wrote for it, Father”, Mr. Walsh answered. “Write to Mrs. Clarke, at the Center.”

A few days later, Father Keleher stopped Mr. Walsh as he was coming out from Mass at Boston College.

“When am I going to get that copy of the status of the Center?” Father Keleher asked him. He then went on to say that he was sure that no document could be produced establishing the Center outside of ordinary ecclesiastical authority.

“That is not what I said of the document”, Mr. Walsh answered. “Why are you acting as messenger for the Archbishop, Father?”

“If you people had any sense,” Father Keleher told him, "you'd know that if the Archbishop became personally involved he would be forced to close the Center because of the heresy emanating from there."

"What heresy, Father?"

Father Keleher did not answer.

"Father," said Jim Walsh, "I cannot understand how you can intellectually affirm, as you did to me in December, that the work of St. Benedict Center is a holy work of God, and yet refuse an act of the will in support of it!"

"I cannot support a disobedient priest", said Father Keleher. "If it were not for my admiration for Father Feeney, I would have fired you all from the faculty long ago!"

My correspondence with Father Keleher then began:

Boston College
University Heights
Chestnut Hill 67
Massachusetts

January 20, 1949.

Office of the President

Mrs. Catherine G. Clarke
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

Dear Mrs. Clarke:

Some time ago Mr. James Walsh of our faculty informed me that you were in possession of a document communicating the wish of the Holy Father, whereby, he established St. Benedict's Circle independent of any ecclesiastic supervision. At the time, I asked Mr. Walsh if I might see a copy of it and he promised to obtain it for me.

After waiting what I considered a sufficient length of time, I called Mr. Walsh again, and, today, he has informed me that I may have a copy of this by applying to you. May I ask, then, that a copy be forwarded to me at your earliest convenience. You will understand that such a setup is so unique that it is arousing a good deal of comment. If I were in a position to establish the fact to those who direct the question to me, I would feel much easier about the whole matter.

Very respectfully yours,
(signed) William L. Keleher, S.J.
President

WLK:vb

St. Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

January 21, 1949.

Very Rev. William L. Keleher, S.J.
President, Boston College,
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.

Dear Father Keleher:—

In answer to your letter of January 20th, may I inform you that St. Benedict Center is a Catholic lay organization, dedicated to Catholic life and Catholic doctrine among young people.

Very respectfully yours,
Catherine Clarke.

CC/NE

Boston College
University Heights
Chestnut Hill 67
Massachusetts
Office of the President

January 24, 1949.

Mrs. Catherine Clarke
St. Benedict's Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dear Mrs. Clarke:

I wish to acknowledge your prompt reply of the 21st; however, the point of my letter seems to have been missed. May I repeat, then, my request that you allow me to have, for presentation to Diocesan Officials, a copy of the document

(Mr. Walsh informs me you have in your possession) in virtue of which, St. Benedict's Center was erected by the Holy Father independent of ecclesiastical supervision.

Very respectfully yours,
(signed) William L. Keleher, S.J.
President

WK:r

St. Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

January 25, 1949.

Very Rev. William L. Keleher, S.J.,
President of Boston College,
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

Dear Father Keleher,

Your first letter puzzled me. Your second letter is even more puzzling. I am completely at a loss to understand why reports to "Diocesan Officials" regarding an organization such as ours should be made through the President of Boston College.

Very respectfully yours,
(signed) Catherine Clarke.

CC/EN

The document to which Mr. Walsh had referred in his conversation with Father Keleher was, of course, the blessing of the Holy Father (which appears in the first chapter of this book), in which the status of St. Benedict Center, namely, that of a lay organization, was stated. Father Keleher and I, after this exchange of letters, had no further correspondence.

XVIII

THE storm signals were roaring in full blast all through the months of January and February. So many rumors flew back and forth on the Boston College campus, so many reports of Faculty teaching on the subject of No Salvation Outside the Church were brought to the three (and only) members of the Boston College Faculty holding for the defined doctrine of the Church, that they were besieged with questions all of the time.

Father Joseph P. Kelly's doctrine, Father William Van Etten Casey's, Father Paul Curtin's, Father Russell Sullivan's were given either to Dr. Maluf, Mr. Walsh or Mr. Ewaskio, or they were brought by Boston College students directly to St. Benedict Center. When the whole thing reached a peak of inconsistency and contradiction, revealing both an amazing ignorance of Church history and of doctrine, Mr. Ewaskio, Mr. Walsh and Dr. Maluf wrote the following letter to the President of Boston College, Father Keleher.

Cambridge, Mass.,
January 24, 1949.

Very Rev. William L. Keleher, S.J.,
President, Boston College,
University Heights,
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.

Dear Father Keleher:

It is a matter of conscience with us to inform you, as the Rector of Boston College, that we are scandalized and grievously concerned about some of the doctrines being taught in this college, and we are especially concerned about the salvation of souls entrusted to the care of the faculty of Boston College. We have intimated to you before, in personal discussions, our worry, and it is clear you have done absolutely nothing about it.

We are placing before your conscience the duty of thoroughly investigating whether, among other things, implicitly or explicitly, the following heresies are being taught at Boston College: (1) that there is salvation outside the Church; (2) that any man can be saved without submission to the authority of our Holy Father, the Pope.

Respectfully yours,
Charles A. Ewaskio
Fakhri Maluf
James R. Walsh

They received a reply from Father Keleher:

January 24, 1949.

Dr. Fakhri Maluf, Mr. James R. Walsh, Mr. Charles A. Ewaskio

Gentlemen:

I am in receipt of your communication of January 24th and it is acknowledged herewith.

A check with the Right Reverend Chancellor of the Diocese, the Deans of the several schools on the campus and the Chairmen of several departments informs me that the charges of your letter are unfounded. May I ask, that at your earliest convenience, you submit to me in writing a detailed and specified report on the heresies being taught at Boston

Very sincerely yours,

College.

(signed) William L. Keleher, S.J.
President.

The men could not take seriously a check which had been completed in half a day on a matter the honest study of which would have consumed a far greater length of time, and to which someone other than the busy president of a college would have had to be assigned.

None of the teachers had taken lightly Father Keleher's last conversation with Mr. Walsh, in which he spoke of firing all three of them from the faculty. Dr. Maluf saw Father Keleher on January 26th, and brought up the subject with him:

Dr. Maluf: "I hear you have threatened to fire us from the College, Father."

Father Keleher: "I think Mr. Walsh must have misunderstood me. I also think that the reason Mr. Walsh would not bring me that document is that there is no such document."

Dr. Maluf: "Honestly, Father, I do not see why St. Benedict Center should be reporting to you on its status. And I don't see why the higher authorities who are acting through you don't act for themselves, unless they are using your position as a threat to us, which I strongly resent as incompatible with my professional rights and with academic liberty. Your letter to Mrs. Clarke was not a friendly letter. When Jim Walsh and I spoke to you on previous occasions, we spoke to you candidly as our Rector, and we never suspected that your authority was being used by forces outside the Boston College campus."

Father Keleher: "I have investigated your charges of heresy, and I find that nobody is teaching a doctrine contrary to the doctrines you mentioned as being the teaching of the Church."

Dr. Maluf: "I don't know what measures you have taken to determine the truth of our charges, Father, and I certainly consider that whatever measures you have taken were not adequate."

Father Keleher: "Make your charges more specific. Whom are you accusing?"

Dr. Maluf: “What motivated us finally to appeal to you cannot be reduced to a few documentary points, and in many cases we do not have the right to divulge the names of students who have come to us in alarm and confusion. As far as doctrine is concerned, the whole place is going haywire. If you want to put the issue before the students, you will find that out for yourself, Father. Now, instead of meeting us on the doctrinal issue, which has been the issue from the beginning, you are trying to settle it by means of threats and intimidations. I must say again that I can't feel that you are sufficiently concerned or that you have taken adequate measures to determine the truth of the charges that we made in our letter. I want you to know, Father, that I am scandalized at your lack of concern to protect the Faith.”

Father Keleher: “All right, Dr. Maluf.”

Doctor Maluf left the President's Office, angrily. The teachers talked the situation over at home, in the evening. They decided once more to write to Father Keleher.

Cambridge, Mass.
January 26, 1949.

Very Reverend William L. Keleher, S.J.,
President of Boston College,
University Heights,
Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Dear Father Rector,

It is very clear that in your private talk with one of us, Mr. James Walsh, that you did use, at least by insinuation, the threat of firing us from the College. This threat could not have proceeded from any principle compatible with basic human and professional liberties. It clearly attacks and undermines a noble value of Christian civilization. We do not hold that the rights and liberties of a professor are absolute and free from any limitations whatsoever, but we do believe that these

> limitations can arise only from the intrinsic substance of the profession as touching the soundness of doctrine and of morals. If such threats could be served arbitrarily and by influences extrinsic to the conscientious performance of our vocation, then you reduce the professor to the status of a tyrannized slave. The teacher's profession in the providence of God is left innocently unprotected by any form of political pressure groups, and therefore its dignity rests upon, and is a measure of, the high values and ideals of a culture. In our previous conversations with you, we have spoken to you candidly as the president of our College, believing that your position is protected by proportionate rights. We are shocked to know that your high position is being used by powers and authorities outside the academic arena, who, if they believed in the justice of their case against us, should proceed on their own personal responsibility and on the merits of their case, by legal and fair proceedings, instead of attempting to persecute and tyrannize us while remaining invisible to us.
>
> This situation is intolerable; it touches the very status of our profession. We, therefore, wish to register our strong protest against your threat, in the name of the rights and dignities of our vocation.
>
> Respectfully yours,
> Fakhri Maluf
> Charles A. Ewaskio
> James R. Walsh

St. Benedict Center decided, also on this same 26th of January, to write His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, a candid statement of its feelings. The letter was delivered at Archbishop's House that evening. No answer to it, however, was ever received, and St. Benedict Center was then at a loss to know where next to turn. The words and actions of the Archbishop and Bishop grew every day more Liberal, and both they and the Jesuit Order were bringing to bear upon us more and more pressure. We knew that every Catholic had the right, in a matter of doctrine, to appeal directly to the Holy Father, and so, out of our completest need, we brought our problem to the Chair of Peter.

St. Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Feast of Our Lady of Lourdes,
February 11, 1949.

To His Holiness, Pope Pius XII,
Vatican City.

Your Holiness,

We, your faithful children, watchful for the preservation of our Holy Faith and deeply concerned about the rising and most imminent danger of false doctrines being fostered and spread even by Catholic colleges and seminaries, wish to place this anguish of soul before Your Holiness, and on our part and on the part of hundreds of our colleagues and students who share our concern and who, after constant prayer, feel we must come to you personally, the Vicar of Our Lord and Saviour on earth, to say to you what the Apostles said to the Master, "Save us, for we perish!"

We are convinced that in this our country there is at this moment a very real and grievous threat to the integrity of our Holy Faith. The wave of error is not beyond control yet, but it will be very soon if not checked, for the poison of false doctrine is spreading by means of educational institutions, magazines, newspapers, books, even receiving official Catholic approval, and the people to whom the Faith is still the pearl of great price can only appeal to you, the successor of St. Peter, for protection.

The insidious heresy that there may be salvation outside the Catholic Church and that submission to the Supreme Pontiff is not necessary for salvation has been taught by implication in many ways but is now getting to be more and more of an explicit teaching.

In more than one way people are made to believe that a man may be saved in any religion provided he is sincere, that a man may have baptism of desire even while explicitly refusing baptism of water, that a man may belong to the soul of the Church while persisting in his enmity to the Holy Catholic Church, indeed even while actively persecuting the Church.

These dangerous doctrines are beginning to manifest themselves even in the practical order in such popular demonstrations as interfaith meetings where a common denominator is sought, giving people to believe that something less than the entirety and the integrity of the Catholic Faith may be sufficient for salvation, to the detriment of every dogma that is peculiar to the Catholic Church. Such slogans as "one religion is as good as another"; "we are saved by personal sincerity"; the "things on which we agree are vastly more important than the things on which we differ";—such slogans are being accepted even by Catholics as substitutes for the Creed.

We assure Your Holiness, as your most loyal children, that if this avalanche is allowed to continue, it will lead to a veritable catastrophe to the Kingdom of Christ and for the scandal and perdition of souls. We will be always ready, at the command of Your Holiness, to present all the documentary evidence in support of our concern.

We have the honor to be
Your Holiness' humble servants in Jesus and Mary,

Fakhri Maluf,
Asst. Professor of Philosophy, Boston College
Catherine Clarke,
President, St. Benedict Center
Daniel Sargent
Professor of English Literature, St. Benedict Center
James R. Walsh,
Instructor in Philosophy, Boston College
Charles Ewaskio
Asst. Professor of Physics, Boston College
Robert G. Walker,
Asst. Professor of English, Boston College
David Supple,
Instructor in German, Boston College High School

Temple Morgan,
Instructor of Greek, St. Benedict Center
Raymond Karam,
Graduate Assistant in Philosophy, St. Benedict Center
Juan Ribera-Faig,
Graduate Assistant in Spanish, St. Benedict Center
Howard Cannon,
Fred Farrell,
Philip Gammans,
Editors, FROM THE HOUSETOPS, St. Benedict Center

The acknowledgment of the above letter will be found on page 172.

In the first week of February had occurred Dr. Maluf's discussion with Father Duncan about his course in St. Thomas, with the subsequent dropping of the course and Dr. Maluf's dismissal from the Graduate School. Father O'Donnell's letter to him read:

Boston College
Graduate School
Chestnut Hill
Massachusetts.

February 7, 1949.

Dr. Fakhri Maluf,
90 Putnam Avenue,
Cambridge 39, Mass.

Dear Dr. Maluf:

I am writing to you to confirm what I told you this morning in my office. I am discontinuing the course, Basic Topics from St. Thomas, which you were to offer in the Graduate School during the second semester.

I am notifying the President of Boston College, the Treasurer's Office, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that your contract with the Graduate School is terminated as of today.

Sincerely yours,
(signed) George A. O'Donnell, S.J.
Dean

Dr. Maluf answered Father O'Donnell's letter on the same day:

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 7, 1949.

Rev. George O'Donnell, S.J.,
Boston College,
Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Dear Father O'Donnell:

For the sake of the records, I would like to ask you to give me a statement explaining the reason why my course in the Graduate School was suspended this term. According to my understanding, the reason is that I have told Father Duncan that I cannot promise not to discuss Grace in a course in the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas.

Very sincerely yours,
Fakhri Maluf

Father O'Donnell did not reply to Dr. Maluf, but he sent the following notice to Mr. Karam, one of Dr. Maluf's students:

Boston College Graduate School
Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.

Dear Mr. Karam:

Dr. Maluf's course on Saturday morning,—Basic Topics from St. Thomas,—has been discontinued.

Please consult Father Duncan, Chairman of the Department of Philosophy, about your schedule of courses.

Sincerely yours,
George A. O'Donnell, S.J.
Dean

It was then that Mr. Karam resigned from Boston College:

Cambridge, Mass.,
February 14, 1949.

Rev. George A. O'Donnell, S.J.,
Dean of the Graduate School,
Boston College.

Reverend Father:

I received your card by mail last Wednesday, February 9th, in which you informed me that the course on St. Thomas given by Dr. Maluf has been suspended. I am writing this letter to notify you of my withdrawal from Boston College. As you well know, I was a student at Harvard University during the last academic year, and it was by the advice of Dr. Maluf that I transferred to Boston College, because it was a Catholic College. I was coming to your college, therefore, in order to study Catholic thought as it is taught by the Doctors of the Church. I am scandalized to find out that this is the last thing that Boston College is interested in. Instead of encouraging courses given on the Doctors in the spirit in which they taught, you deliberately eliminate such courses, making it impossible for a Catholic student to receive a Catholic education. On the contrary, the study of such sophists and enemies of Christ as Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Einstein and many others, is encouraged and made popular. As a result I have found that Boston College is no different from such secular colleges as Harvard, except that its teachings are under the auspices of the Catholic Church and the Jesuit Order.

When I first came to see you, you told me that you did not approve of the philosophy that is being taught at Harvard University, but I am discovering that, under the guidance of Father Duncan, the philosophy department at Boston College is following the pattern and ideals of Harvard. Consequently I cannot in conscience continue to study in this college, seeing that my faith is no more secure here than it would be in any secular college, and that it is impossible for me to get a Catholic education at this institution.

Respectfully yours,
Raymond Karam

Mr. Karam then transferred for full time work to St. Benedict Center, where he had been taking part-time courses. He began work on his famous "Reply to a Liberal", his answer to the attack on FROM THE HOUSETOPS by the Rev. Philip Donnelly, S.J. This work of Mr. Karam's was sent, eventually, to every Catholic bishop, archbishop and cardinal in the world, to the Pope and to the Holy Office. It had a second printing, and we are still receiving requests for it.

On February 18th, Father Feeney received another letter from the American Assistant to the General of the Jesuit Order, who was making his visits to the Jesuit Houses in the United States.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs
Indiana

February 18, 1949.

Dear Father Feeney:

P.C.

Pardon my delay in acknowledging your very prompt reply to my letter. I greatly appreciate your promptness, and only press of travel and work prevented my writing you before this.

Your letter leaves me still very much in the dark, and has relieved little of my anxiety. Is it not true that last August, when other Province assignments were made, you were assigned to work at Holy Cross, and you have steadfastly refused to accept the transfer from St. Benedict's Center? You know, dear Father, as well as I, how serious a matter disobedience is considered in the Society. You claim to have a most serious difficulty which prohibits your leaving your present field of work,—a difficulty which concerns the glory of God, the salvation of your soul, and the security of the Society in your Province. Forgive me, if I say those words clarify nothing, but only bewilder one. Knowing you as I do, I cannot but feel sure that you are acting in good faith, moved by some reason you judge legitimate. But it is a clear case where you must subject your judgment to the judgment of others, who are no less concerned about the integrity of the Society's Institute and fair name, and about the salvation of your soul.

Six months is a long time to wait for the obedience of a member of the Society of Jesus. Superiors may be patient and long-suffering, and I know how incessantly they have been praying and offering Masses for the happy solution of this sad and trying situation, but they also have a duty to the Society, and they cannot put off action indefinitely. You speak of waiting till I come; but according to present plans, that would not be until more months passed; which is too long.

I pray that the Holy Spirit may illumine your zealous soul with His most precious gift of simple, humble faith so necessary for the complete obedience demanded by our vocation. Do pray for me.

Faithfully yours in Corde Jesu SS.,
Vincent A. McCormick, S.J.

Father replied to the General's Assistant:

Feast of St. Peter Damian
February 23, 1949.

Dear Father McCormick, P.C.

Your letter has just reached me.

In answer to your first question, may I say that I was *not* appointed to Holy Cross College at the time of the usual appointments last year. My status, given me in July, presumably for the following year, was to continue my work at St. Benedict Center. I even had letters from Father McEleney subsequent to status day, clearly assuming that this was my appointment for the year. On the strength of that appointment, I assumed in the name of St. Benedict Center very serious obligations in the matter of faculty, courses, personnel among the students, and arrangements with the Veterans Administration, all of which could not be handled under the circumstances except by my direction and understanding of the regime that is here.

Then suddenly, I should say about six weeks later, just after Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright had departed on a boat for Europe, I received a mysterious letter from Father McEleney telling me to leave the Center and go to Holy Cross. I went immediately to him to ask for some kind of explanation so as to avoid consternation and scandal among the nearly 1200 young people with whom I was dealing, either by way of day courses or instruction classes or evening lectures. Father McEleney refused to give me any explanation whatsoever except to let it slip that higher authorities wanted it, and that my doctrine was being questioned. When I asked

> him who were the higher authorities and what was the doctrine, he took recourse into evasive, non-committal, legally-phrased statements intended to supply me with no information other than that obedience is our paramount virtue. I beseeched him to make that obedience a paternal, filial arrangement,—and that he has consistently refused to do.
>
> I mention these facts very summarily since it seems to be the sort of reply you are looking for. You know very well, dear Father, that the crux of this whole matter lies deeper than appears on the surface. The difficulty is a *doctrinal* and not a disciplinary one. Until this is cleared, I have no other recourse than that which is in keeping with the preservation of my conscience and with my loyalty to the Holy See and my Faith.
>
> This morning I had an hour's conference with my Superior, Father Louis Gallagher, S.J., of 300 Newbury St., Boston. He assures me that I am entitled to a personal hearing with you on a matter which I cannot in conscience discuss by mail. If you doubt my filial behaviour in this whole matter, with the one superior who would give me a hearing, won't you please write to Father Gallagher and ask him if what I tell you is not so?
>
> Sincerely yours in Jesus and Mary,
> Leonard Feeney, S.J.

". . . I have no other recourse than that which is in keeping with the preservation of my conscience and with my loyalty to the Holy See and my Faith." Thank God for Father Feeney! In the face of a threat of great personal loss for himself, after thirty-four years in the Jesuit Order, he safeguards for us all those things which are most precious to man: his hold on the Truth which makes him free; his personal responsibility for right and wrong; his free will; as well as the beautiful concept of obedience which St. Ignatius of Loyola had in mind when he founded the Society of Jesus. St. Ignatius never meant the isolation of obedience whereby it is served at the expense of the other virtues. This would make of obedience not an honorable thing, but a tool which could be a dangerous power.

We were startled and disturbed to find that the concern of Father McEleney, Father McCormick, and—we came sadly to find out—the General of the Society of Jesus, Father Janssens, was not for the honor and glory of God and the preservation of the Faith, but always for the prestige and well-being of an organization, the Society of Jesus. We have letter after letter, reported interview after interview, in which this policy is clearly brought out. This was the sorry condition to which Liberalism had reduced the great Order founded by St. Ignatius.

It was, evidently, for the *political* good of the New England Province of the Society of Jesus that Father Leonard Feeney be transferred. His brand of honest orthodoxy, direct and unequivocal, was embarrassing to too many people, whom the truth would hurt. Now, ironically, St. Ignatius, the founder of the Society of Jesus, would have recognized in the protests surrounding Father Feeney the very signs he had always looked for in his priests, signs that they were doing the work of God. It is told of St. Ignatius that when he noticed his priests getting along exceedingly well and no noise was heard from their quarter, he would write the priests, asking, "What is the matter? You can't be telling the truth of Jesus Christ and be getting along so well! You must be compromising. 'As they persecuted Me, so will they persecute you!' "

Compromise is the language of the weak. Legalism is the weapon of the tyrant. St. Ignatius of Loyola never called the virtue for which he wanted his sons to be famous "obedience". He called it "holy obedience", to keep his sons secure in their allegiance to the Pope and to the dogmas of the Faith. Father Feeney was disobedient legally, technically. But his disobedience was by way of being loyal to something higher than the political intrigues with which even Jesuits can become involved in a city like Boston. St. Ignatius knows that Father Feeney was a loyal Jesuit in the substance of his vow, even though he was banned in Boston.

XIX

THE decision to write a letter to the General of the Society of Jesus—which letter eventually brought about the dismissal from Boston College of the four teachers who signed it—was taken out of sheer inability to find a superior in Boston who was (1) not a Liberal himself, and (2) who knew much about or who was concerned enough about the doctrines of the Church to investigate the teaching of them.

Dr. Maluf and Mr. Walsh had, in a succession of interviews, made clear to the President of Boston College their worries about certain doctrines of the Church as they were taught at Boston College. The President, as a result, threatened to dismiss them from the College. They next presented their protest to him by letter, as a matter of conscience, begging him to investigate the matter for himself. The President thought the charges ridiculous, because his "investigation" was superficial and inadequate. The enigma of this was solved for us later, when by his own declaration it was found that President Keleher held the same liberal doctrines as his faculty were teaching.

Indeed, after the teachers' protest to Father Keleher, matters went from bad to worse at Boston College. The head of Mr. Ewaskio's department, Father Tobin, came to him. He reminded Mr. Ewaskio that he was a married man with children, and his loyalty to the particular doctrine of no salvation outside the Church could prove disastrous to a teacher with responsibilities. Mr. Ewaskio explained to Father Tobin that it was precisely because he held this doctrine that he had come into the Catholic Church, and Father Tobin was unable to move him.

Boston College students brought to us the dismal news that Father Philip Donnelly's liberal article, "Observations on the Question of Salvation Outside the Church", was now required reading in some of the religion courses at the College. Several St. Benedict Center students, employed in part-time work for large corporations in Boston, were given copies of Father Donnelly's article, which was being circulated in their offices.

Boston College students were warned by the Jesuit Fathers not to come to St. Benedict Center. The doctrine of no salvation outside the Church became question material for examinations at Boston College, and the confusion of interpretation on the part of the Faculty went from inconsistency to contradiction. We were finally to see an examination paper of Father Russell M. Sullivan, S.J., of the Religion Department, for "Sophomore, 1st Semester", entitled *The Act of Faith,* six pages in length, done in the form of a True and False score sheet. It is the most amazing thing of its kind we have ever seen. Questions 71-86 were unusual in that they were not on the reading matter which the examination was supposedly testing. (The questions were all expected to be answered as *true*.) Page 4 would seem clearly to be an attack on St. Benedict Center and Fr. Feeney. For instance, to quote a few sentences:

> "My dear Joe: Just answer me briefly, as you did the last time, by marking True or False where I indicate it. My Pal is always talking about Religion. He knows very little. He said that they did not study religion in class at Hitch Hike University. He believes in God and in life after death. But is he off on the subject of Faith!

> ". . . He said that he heard a teacher in a Catholic school say that it was impossible for a man to be saved who did not join the Catholic Church. I told him that I followed the teachings of the Catholic Church, not the statements of any one individual, and that is what Catholics are supposed to do (76). (True or False?) He got me sore when he said: 'But this teacher said that the Popes had said that non-Catholics are in bad faith.' I at once pulled out a copy of *The New York Times* and read to him the following: '. . . The Church surrounds dissenters in the faith with sincere love and prayer for their return to her, their mother, from whom God knows how many are separated without any fault of their own.'
>
> "And I mentioned that the Pope had said that on September 5, 1948, in an address to the German people over the Vatican Radio (77). He asked if that was the teaching of Catholic theologians, and I said: 'That doctrine is held as a certain and common doctrine by Catholic theologians as can be verified by looking at theological text books' (78). He thanked me for the information but said: 'Is an act of divine faith absolutely necessary for salvation?' I said, 'There is no getting to Heaven without making an act of divine faith' (79). Then he wanted to know how people who never heard about Christ or the Trinity or the Incarnation could make an act of divine faith in what Christ had taught. I replied: 'If such people cooperate freely with the grace that God will surely give them, provided that they do not reject the means that God will give them, God will give them the grace to make an act of divine faith (80).' "

The last sentences of this extraordinary paragraph evoked from a confused student reading it in the Center the inelegant, but apt, question, "What does that last mean? Is he saying: 'Yes, if we have cream, we'll have bananas and cream, if we have the bananas'?"

"And Question Number 77 says," remarked Raymond Karam, "You give me the decisions of the Popes defining, but aha! I pull my *New York Times* on you, and there I've got you, for infallible pronouncement!"

It was decided to appeal to the General of the Jesuits. He lived in Rome, and we hoped that Italian realism and Roman orthodoxy would produce more in the way of common sense protection of the Faith than Boston Liberalism mixed with Plymouth Rock transcendentalism seemed able to offer.

90 Putnam Ave.,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Feast of St. Matthias,
February 24, 1949.

The Very Rev. Jean Baptiste Janssens, S.J.,
General of the Society of Jesus,
Borgo Santo Spirito 5,
Rome, Italy.

Dear Father General:—

We are appealing to you on a matter of great gravity, involving the protection of our Holy Faith and the salvation of many souls.

We are professors at Boston College, which is under the direction of the Society of Jesus. We are convinced that at Boston College many doctrines are being taught by members of the Society of Jesus which are contrary to defined dogmas of the Faith. They are teaching implicitly and explicitly that there may be salvation outside the Catholic Church, that a man may be saved without admitting that the Roman Church is supreme among all the churches, and that a man may be saved without submission to the Pope.

We assure you that we would not have appealed to your high office unless we had exhausted every legitimate means of alerting all the proximate authorities of the Society without avail. We further assure you that we have very ample evidence to support our charges, which evidence will be produced at your demand.

We are Your Reverence's humble servants in Christ,

Fakhri Maluf
Asst. Prof. of Philosophy at Boston College
James R. Walsh

Instructor in Philosophy at Boston College
Charles Ewaskio
Asst. Prof. in Physics at Boston College
David D. Supple
Instructor of German, Boston College High School

No answer to this letter was ever received from the General of the Society of Jesus.

On April 5th, we received an acknowledgment of our letter to the Holy Father:

Vatican City, March 25, 1949.
SEGRETERIA DI STATO
DI
SUA SANTITÁ
N. 196925/SA

> The Secretariat of State, at the gracious bidding of the Holy Father acknowledges receipt of the document submitted to Him by Mr. Fakhri Maluf, and bearing the signatures of various Professors of Boston College High School and of St. Benedict's Center, and, while communicating that it has been forwarded to the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office for consideration and attention, has pleasure in assuring the signatories that His Holiness, appreciating the Catholic sentiments which prompted their gesture, cordially imparts to them His paternal Apostolic Blessing.
>
> (stamped with the seal of
> the Secretariat of State)

On April the first, Father Feeney had his long and prayerfully awaited interview with the American Assistant to the General of the Jesuits, Father Vincent McCormick, S.J. At three o'clock on that afternoon, in the Provincial's Room at Boston College, Father saw for the first time in years the priest who had been his teacher, long ago, at Woodstock College.

Father McCormick greeted Father Feeney very cordially, took both his hands in his, and told him in affectionate terms how delighted he was to see him, how distressed he was at what had happened, and how anxious he was to see the matter settled according to God's will.

Father Feeney told Father Assistant that he had been very anxious to see him, too, that he had always been led to believe through his superior, Father Gallagher, that someone higher than Father McEleney would arrange for a hearing for him, and that that was why he was so pleased ultimately to learn that he allowed him to remain in Boston until his visitation. They talked for a few moments about Father McCormick's health, which had not been too good, but Father McCormick passed this off, and then got down to business:

> "I have not as yet seen Father McEleney", he said. "I wanted to see you first and hear what you have to say."

Father Feeney was tempted to ask Father McCormick if he had been in contact with Father McEleney by letter, by telephone, or by delegate, but he allowed him to say that technically he had not seen Father McEleney since his arrival in Boston a day or two before. Father Feeney was even tempted to ask Father McCormick if Father McEleney had come to see him. Father's inner thoughts, in Father McCormick's presence, will indicate the tenseness of the situation, which Father Assistant, for all his obvious, kindly manner, could not dissipate. Father Assistant himself was extremely nervous, and was biting his fingernails all during the interview.

Father McCormick: "I do not know anything that has caused so many people to be distressed as this unfortunate affair. I do not know anything ever that has evoked so many prayers from priests and nuns and even lay people, as this situation. I am anxious to see it settled not only *for the good of the Society and your Province* but also for the salvation of your own soul. The only way it can be settled is by doing the will of God no matter how difficult or unjust or harsh it may seem to be. And the will of God as indicated to you is the voice of Father Provincial, which means that you must go to Holy Cross as you were told and leave everything else to the will of God—that is what is meant by obedience, as every good Jesuit understands when he makes his vows."

Father Feeney: "Well first, Father Assistant, I think you must agree that I have never been conspicuously hard to rule. I think I have been, if only by reason of temperament, a somewhat docile Jesuit."

Father McCormick: "That I agree—and that is why I expect you to be in this emergency the splendid Leonard Feeney we all know and love and admire. You have great talents, great gifts, and great charm; and I am sure there is much splendid work left for you to do provided you do the will of God as is clearly indicated to you now by the voice of your superior."

Father Feeney: "Do you realize how much it has cost me in suffering and misunderstanding and persecution not to do the 'will of God' as you call it in this matter? You know very well that instead of commanding me under holy obedience to obey his fraudulent order, Father McEleney has gone out of his way, by every arrangement possible, with everyone with whom I was associated, to try to ruin my morale and my reputation so that his tyrannical order could be obeyed."

Father McCormick: "Why do you call it tyrannical? Every order of obedience could be called tyrannical if you cared to term it so."

Father Feeney: "Father, I know that you know that this was the strangest order ever given by a Jesuit superior. If it were a clear mandate of obedience, why did Father Provincial not give it to me on status day, when the time for the yearly appointments was at hand. Why must he wait for the Archbishop and Bishop to be two days out at sea, why must he inform the Vicar General before he has informed me, and then hide behind him so as to make his order effective? Why should a Jesuit superior assume that he has no authority over his subject who has taken a vow of obedience until he has made a secret arrangement with the Archbishop, Bishop, and Vicar General as to how he can make it effective? Why was my obedience so suspected by Father McEleney even before he gave the order?"

Father McCormick: "Now, come, come. We can't go into all that. That is all involved and complicated and entirely beside the point. You are a subject, and a good subject must obey."

Father Feeney: "But Father McEleney is your subject. Why don't you insist that he rule decently?"

Father McCormick: "A superior does not have to tell his subjects why he does things. Father McEleney did not have to tell you why he moved you."

Father Feeney: "He did tell me why he moved me. He said it was by the bidding of higher authorities and for my doctrine."

Father McCormick: "Did he say that?"

Father Feeney: "Yes, he let that slip, and then regretted he had said it. But even if he hadn't said it at all, I know that it was the reason. I also know the reason why Archbishop Cushing went to Lowell House, and Bishop Wright spoke at the Liberal Union."

Father McCormick: "You think Bishop Wright knew about this?"

Father Feeney: "I'm sure he did. It was even arranged that my dismissal should come exactly at the point when he and the Archbishop were on the high seas, and could not give me a hearing. I cabled to Archbishop Cushing. I cabled twice to Bishop Wright. It did me no good. Father McEleney tried to make my being pushed out of the diocese of Boston—which is the fact of the matter—seem as if I was merely being transferred to Holy Cross. The point of my being sent to Worcester is that it is out of this diocese, which is what Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing wanted. My whole vocation and priesthood and reputation are at stake, Father Assistant! If I am hitting back in strong fashion, it is because I terribly protest the type of vilification of my character which has been going on for seven solid months, in secret and sly ways, by my Jesuit brothers and my Provincial. You know, and so does every superior in this Province, and in every house I have ever lived in, that this is the first time in my life I have ever attacked a fellow Jesuit. You can go through all the files in Rome, and you will not find one sentence of complaint by me against anyone."

Father McCormick: "That is true. And that is why I feel all this strong language does not represent your true character."

Father Feeney: "I believe that my reasons for staying at St. Benedict Center are loving ones, instead of resentful ones."

Father McCormick: "What possible reason can keep you there, against the will of your superior, which is a loving reason?"

Father Feeney: "Just as no one in Rome has ever heard a word of complaint from me about anyone, so I believe there is no one of a complaining nature that has not perhaps had something to tell you about me. In my writings at least, I have been something of a public character. I do not think there is a priest or nun or

Catholic school child who does not know some of my writings, and I know many converts have been helped into the Church by encouragement from some of the things I have written. I do not think I try to conceal my defects in my writings— And my defects are: that I use superlatives, that I raise my voice, that I gesticulate and make faces and push home a point too strongly, and that I am not overtactful in taking into account what non-Catholics will think when I talk—. All these facts and general comments on my many defects are the property of all people who have ever heard me. And so I think I could say, almost better than any American Jesuit you will meet on your visitation, that I am not a saint. Now, while knowing this to be true, I still dare to say that it is Our Blessed Lady who is keeping me at St. Benedict Center. I hesitate to say this to you, because when I once said it to another priest, he spread the rumor around that I was claiming to have had a vision from Our Lady!"

Father McCormick: "If you think you are being changed for matters of doctrine, why did you not go to Holy Cross and then put in your appeal *in devolutivo*?"

Father Feeney: "First I wanted Father McEleney openly to state that was why he was changing me. He by accident admitted that it was the reason. I knew very well that it was the reason. But he did not want me to know that it was the reason, because then he would have to defend a heresy. Part of the whole horror of the heresy that has infected our Province, including the terribly incompetent professors in our seminaries, is contained in Father Philip Donnelly's attack on FROM THE HOUSETOPS. Did you read Mr. Karam's article on 'Liberal Theology and Salvation' in the December issue?"

Father McCormick: "Yes, I looked at it."

Father Feeney: "Didn't you agree with it?"

Father McCormick: "There were some things in it which were wrong."

Father Feeney: "What things?"

Father McCormick: "We can't go into that matter now."

Father Feeney: "You are now putting yourself in my regard in the same position as Father McEleney. What Mr. Karam holds is what I hold. If what I hold is wrong, why not tell me where it is wrong? Why go sending me to Holy Cross College? I am going to teach the same doctrine up there. If what I am teaching is heresy, you owe it to the boys not to let me teach any more until I have mended my doctrine. Don't you think you ought to be solicitous for the dogmas of the Church?"

Father McCormick: "My solicitude for the dogmas of the Church I shall have to leave for another situation. My business now is the *good of the Society, the good of the Province,* and *thereby* the good of your soul."

Father Feeney: "Why not be good to all souls? I think it would be better for me to be a disobedient Jesuit than an heretical one. Don't you?"

Father McCormick: "You are supposed to obey your superior."

Father Feeney: "A decent superior giving decent commands does so with decent credentials,—at appointment time, and not after deals with secular priests who are trying to control our Order. Everybody admits that Bishop Wright is trying to run our Order. I hope for a great deal from you. You know very well, Father Assistant, what havoc has been done to the Jesuit Order in the United States by the Visitors who have come over from Rome as American Assistants. All they looked to was the political advantage of our Order and never for its blazing ideals as outlined by St. Ignatius. Please don't be a Visitor like that, and leave nothing but havoc behind you."

Father McCormick: "You are making a mistake in calling me a full-fledged Visitor. I am not a Father Visitor to the American Provinces. I am over here to take care of a certain number of problems, but not to be a Visitor in full jurisdiction."

Father Feeney: "Well, whatever you are, please tell Father General what I am trying to say. Did you hear from Father General about the letter written to him by the Boston College teachers?"

Father McCormick: "You mean accusing Boston College of teaching heresy?"

Father Feeney: "Yes."

Father McCormick: "I did. And that is utterly absurd. There is no heresy being taught at Boston College."

Father Feeney: "Father Assistant, you are wrong. It is being taught at Boston College that there is salvation outside the Church. It is being taught at Boston College that the Church is the 'ordinary means' for salvation but that there is another and 'extraordinary means'. The dogma of no salvation outside the Church is so miserably explained in the religion classes that in one class you are flunked if you say there is no salvation outside the Church, and in another class you are passed for saying there is no salvation outside the Church provided you add an explanation to your admission of this dogma which undoes all its effect. Religion at Boston College is an absolute minor interest. Father Assistant, if you doubt that heresy is being taught at Boston College, I implore you to go over, I think it is the day after tomorrow, and listen to

Father J. Franklin Ewing, S.J., lecture on evolution to the students. I think you have it on your conscience now to go, now that I have accused him of teaching heresy. If the General will not listen to the Boston College lay teachers, you certainly cannot refuse to listen to me. I have been your student; you know that I have not a too bad mind in Theology. I was offered an opportunity to study and teach it in our Society. I positively declare that Father Ewing and Father Doherty, in their anthropology classes, are teaching heresy, to the total undoing of the inspired book of Genesis and to making Catholic boys believe that the explanation of the origin of man is best derived not from Scripture or the definitions of the Church or the teaching of the twenty-nine doctors, but from a blasphemously atheistic hypothesis, like Hooton of Harvard gives. Father Ewing is one of Mr. Hooton's leading disciples.* Why not trust me in this emergency for which you say so many people are praying? Why not go once to a Father Ewing lecture, or call in some of the Weston Fathers for a conference in theology, and then tell me if in conscience as a Jesuit Superior you can make arbitrary discipline your major interest and let Catholic doctrine go to the dogs?"

---

* Professor Earnest A. Hooton has taught at Harvard since 1913 and has written many books on evolution. Recently, January 6, 1950, he made headlines in Boston: PROF. HOOTON BACKS 'MERCY KILLER'. The *Boston Traveler* quoted him as saying:

"If 'thou shalt not kill' is a 'law of God' that convicts Dr. Sander of murder, let us have done with such a savage and sub-human deity and substitute a god of mercy and loving kindness!"

". . . I hold (the medical profession) to be the noblest and most useful of human pursuits—not excluding religion. . ."

"Laymen will have to be educated and liberated from the thralldom of religious superstition before proper enactments can be made" (to make such killings legal).

Father McCormick: "Couldn't you have told all this to the General by letter from Holy Cross?"

Father Feeney: "No, I could not, and for many reasons. First of all, I had taken it for granted, due to Father Provincial's appointment at status time, that I was to be at St. Benedict Center for the year. I had made commitments to these students. In strict natural justice, Father McEleney owed it to me to give me and my students a hearing in view of the fact of my year's commitment. Every time one of my students or a committee of them tried to see him, he avoided them. He would not even answer a letter. He had already let it be known, through Father William FitzGerald, that they were a bunch of radicals, whom Father FitzGerald was going to take in hand and control. But even this point, strong as it is, is a minor one compared with the fact that I was being put out of St. Benedict Center because I held a dogma of the Faith. Subsequent events in every sector prove this, as well as Father McEleney's absolute refusal to give me a hearing so as to make a doctrinal defense. And, oh Father, I beseech you to watch the theologians who come from the Gregorian in Rome. They do not know their theology lovingly and devoutly. They absolutely snub our two great Doctors, St. Peter Canisius and St. Robert Bellarmine. Their heroes are some second rater, usually some Liberal like De La Taille, Bainvel, or Teilhard de Chardin."

Father McCormick: "Teilhard de Chardin's works have been discarded."

Father Feeney: "Why did you not discard him when he came to Weston some years ago and taught his evolutionary theories to our theologians? The Gregorian theologians seem to be superficial specialists. I myself heard the canon law professor at Weston, whose legalisms rule this Province in many affairs, state that the Athanasian Creed holds that *Pater est creans, et Filius est creans, et Spiritus Sanctus creans, sed non sunt tres creantes sed unus creans.* When I vehemently objected that the Athanasian Creed said nothing of the kind, but that what it did say was: *Pater est increatus, et Filius increatus, et Spiritus Sanctus increatus,* and that it was horrid to hear a professor of theology get the words *creans* and *increatus* mixed up, he merely put me down as a poet or possibly an excitable person who likes to make objections."

Father McCormick: "All this is beside the point. My duty here today is to ask you once and for all, 'Are you or are you not going to obey your Provincial?' "

Father Feeney: "Is it all over with me if I do not?"

Father McCormick: "I am afraid it is."

Father Feeney: "Is this final?"

Father McCormick: "Yes, this is final."

Father Feeney: "All right, Father. I cannot do what you ask me to do in conscience. I never had one doubt about my vocation all my years. I know I am doing what St. Ignatius would want me to do, and therefore I accept this as final. You can do what you care to."

Father McCormick stood up and took Father Feeney's hand. He said: "Oh come now. That must never be. I came here to do a work and I failed. But I am still not going to give up hoping and praying that this will turn out as it should. I am going to hope and pray."

Father Feeney: "Thank you, Father. And I would like your blessing." Father McCormick gave his blessing perfunctorily.

Father McCormick held Father Feeney's hand, and said, "Good-bye, Good-bye."

Father Feeney: "Apart from all this, I still remember you as my teacher in theology, and the happy year I spent with you in the study of the Sacraments. I want you to know that my gratitude and admiration and affection for you as my teacher I shall always keep."

Father McCormick, very quietly: "Thank you."

The interview lasted one hour. Father McCormick stayed on at Boston College for several days. He returned to Boston later in the summer, but he did not ask to see Father Feeney again.

X X

AND then the storm, which had been gathering in intensity for seven months, broke over St. Benedict Center. It has not, as I write—seven months later—yet spent itself. It lashed us in its fury, and spilled out into the world; for it became international news.

The lightning and thunder of the storm revealed a world, the part, that is, which was Catholic, become almost entirely Liberal. It showed a scared, frightened Catholic world, lacking the courage to profess its Faith; terrified before the oncoming rush of Communism. It had gone so far astray, this Catholic world, that it no longer realized that the way to defeat an enemy, even a Communistic one, is with the weapons of Christ, and not with material friendships and money. It failed to remember the lesson of Pope St. Leo, the Great, who, with the might of the barbarian forces encamped before Rome, went out to meet, and subsequently defeat, the Hun, all the while armed only with the weapon which is uniquely the Pope's—the power of Peter.

The storm broke in Holy Week, as the Center was preparing its Passion Play. David Thomson, the student director, had, on Palm Sunday, partially transformed the upper portion of the main room of the Center in readiness for the first performance, to be given on Wednesday. On Monday, a letter came for Dr. Maluf:

Boston College
University Heights
Chestnut Hill 67
Massachusetts.

Office of the President

April 11, 1949.

Dr. Fakhri Maluf,
90 Putnam Avenue,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dear Doctor Maluf:

I have just received from Father Janssens word of your letter to him under date of February 24th.* In connection with this matter, I would like to see you in my office on Wednesday, April 13th, at 2:30 p.m.

In the event that any teaching assignment here at Boston College may conflict with this hour, I have notified the various deans that I shall expect you here and they will take care of the classes.

Very sincerely yours,
(signed) William L. Keleher, S.J.
President.

Mr. Charles Ewaskio and Mr. James Walsh received letters identical to Dr. Maluf's.

When the three teachers left St. Benedict Center on Wednesday for their interview with the President of Boston College, the Center was ready for the Passion Play. One could glimpse through the half-drawn curtains at the far end, a supper room. Around the long table, thirteen chairs had been placed. Over to the side of the Center was the outline of a public square, with palace and praetorium.

Dr. Maluf, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Ewaskio arrived at the office of the President of Boston College at the appointed time. They were admitted by Father Keleher's secretary into a large reception room which opened into his office, and which was other than the ordinary room where people usually waited to see him. They were there about ten minutes, when Father Keleher came to see them.

---

* See p. 171 for this letter.

Father Keleher: "I have written to you in connection with the letter you sent to the General of the Jesuit Order. I have received instructions from the General to the effect that the signatories of that letter be presented singly before a Board of one priest and two laymen and be asked certain questions by me."

Dr. Maluf: "Your letter invited us to meet with you personally, Father, and if we are to be presented before a Board we should have been given the right to know that ahead of time."

Father Keleher: "This arrangement was indicated to me by the General and I was asked to send you only the information that was given you in the letters. And besides, the members of the Board are not going to ask any questions, because I am going to do all the talking."

Dr. Maluf: "What directions you might have received from the General do not concern us. We are shocked at the way the General handled our appeal, because we made it clear to him that we had no confidence in you to be the judge in this matter. And whatever directions you have received from him, we still feel that it is our right to know what we were invited for and whom we were invited to meet. In your letter you explicitly invited us to meet you, personally."

Father Keleher: "You will merely be asked to retract your statements and, in case you refuse to do that, your connection with Boston College will be severed as of this moment."

Mr. Walsh: "To retract those statements is to us equivalent to a betrayal of our Catholic Faith, for everyone of those statements has already been defined and proclaimed by the Popes and Councils and taught by the 29 Doctors of the Church."

Father Keleher: "That's the way it seems to you, but we have to go by the interpretation of doctrine as determined by the Bishop."

Mr. Walsh: "No interpretation of a dogma could be a contradiction of it. What you are really asking us to do is to deny three basic doctrines of the Faith. If you say that you are merely asking us to retract some interpretation of them, I would like to know at what point interpretation ceases. Is it an infinite chain?"

Mr. Ewaskio: "If I had been told two years ago that there was salvation outside the Church, I might never have become a Catholic."

Father Keleher: "In your case, since you knew you had to become a Catholic—"

Mr. Ewaskio: "The only reason I knew was because Father Feeney told it to me so unequivocally, and Father has hundreds of converts because he does tell them that."

Dr. Maluf: "It's very strange that we who proved our solicitude for the Faith by appealing for a determination of orthodoxy should be the only ones to stand trial. Are you going to carry this investigation to all the members of the Faculty? Or else by what principle are you singling us out for this trial?"

Father Keleher: "The principle is that no *Catholic* teaching at a Catholic College should deviate from the official interpretation of Catholic doctrine as determined by the bishop."

Mr. Walsh: "So you mean that a non-Catholic is free to teach anything he wants in a Catholic College, and only the liberty of a Catholic is limited?"

Father Keleher: "A Catholic is subject to the laws of the Church in a way in which a non-Catholic is not. And that's why non-Catholics are asked to teach only neutral subjects."

Mr. Ewaskio: "What do you mean by a neutral subject? All truths are related somehow to the First Truth."

Dr. Maluf: "I was asked to leave the Graduate School because I refused to conform to the opinion held by the majority of theologians in this area at this time. If you hold that this interpretation is the opinion of the majority of theologians in this area and at this time, how about the liberty of opinion as understood by Catholic Universities throughout the ages? And if you hold that your opinion is defined, show us where it is defined. If this is a universal Catholic truth, it should have been held by the Catholics throughout the Ages."

Father Keleher: "There is a passage in an encyclical of Pius IX."

Mr. Walsh: "That encyclical was not infallible."

Dr. Maluf: "Even that encyclical is usually mistranslated and always misinterpreted the way the Liberals use it."

Father Keleher: "I am not here to discuss the theological issues with you. I am here merely to present you one by one before a Board of one priest and two laymen and to ask you a few definite questions, which you are merely to answer 'yes' or 'no'."

Dr. Maluf: "You are also adding the threat of firing us from our jobs unless we retract the statements we made in our letter to the General. Throughout the history of the Church, when there was true concern about the preservation of the Faith, there used to be legal processes of determining a man's orthodoxy by studying his writings and his sayings. What statement has any of us made that in your estimation is suspect of heresy? Or is this an arbitrary measure of vengeance simply because we have appealed to the General of the

Order and expressed to him our worry of what others are teaching in this college?"

Father Keleher: "I repeat again that I am not here to argue with you. Do you or don't you wish to face the Board?"

Mr. Ewaskio: "You are very clearly taking an unfair advantage of our love for our families and our concern for their livelihood."

Mr. Walsh: "You have never faced our arguments. You have never even remotely suggested what in our doctrine is unsound. All you have done right from the beginning is to use implicit or explicit threats. We are clearly living in a regime of intimidation."

Dr. Maluf: "To ask us to retract the statements we made to the General is itself an act of heresy on your part."

Father Keleher: "I was asked to do that by the General."

Dr. Maluf: "I still say that these are defined doctrines and that their integrity is to be safeguarded apart from the interpretation of them. No interpretation could annul the substance of a dogma."

Mr. Walsh: "If the General is asking us to withdraw these statements, then maybe the General is in heresy."

Father Keleher: "How can we tolerate you when you are accusing us of heresy?"

Dr. Maluf: "We are not only accusing you of heresy, we are accusing you of persecuting those who hold the Catholic doctrine in its integrity and its entirety. We protest the way the General has handled our appeal. He has made you, the antagonist, to be the judge. And we certainly insist on our right to know from the summons the nature of what it is we were called to your office for. If it is a question of retracting those three statements in our letter to the General, I, on my part, can tell you that I am not capable of doing that."

Mr. Walsh: "And neither am I."

Mr. Ewaskio: "And neither am I."

Dr. Maluf: "Is that irrevocable, Father? Are you definitely giving us the alternative of retracting those statements or of being fired?"
Father Keleher: "Yes, I am."
Dr. Maluf: "We question your right to do that."
Father Keleher: "We have taken all that into consideration."
Dr. Maluf: "All right. You have taken the measure, and you take responsibility for it."

The three teachers walked out of the President's Office—dismissed, for doctrine, from Boston College. This dismissal affected also one other teacher, since the General had included all signers of his letter. David Supple, instructor in German at Boston College High School, had signed the letter. He could not in conscience retract, and so he, too, lost his job.

The men made a short visit of thanksgiving to St. Mary's Chapel, at Boston College—thanksgiving because to them had been given the privilege of confessing their faith, and of suffering for it.

They came back to a Center darkened and hung in purple. The men and girls, who were to go through so much ignominy and persecution with them in the months to follow, were seated with the priest who was to pay, with all that was dearest to him, for *his* defense of the Faith.

They were watching the Passion Play, the portrayal of the Passion and Death of Jesus of Nazareth, because He would not retract His doctrine, that doctrine which gave to all who followed it eternal life.

Part 3

SALVATION MAKES THE HEADLINES

XXI

NO SALVATION outside the Church! By a most amazing and clearly providential set of circumstances, this doctrine, on Holy Thursday morning, 1949, eight months before the turn of the half century, went out over the national and international wires of the great daily newspapers. It went out into a world greatly in need of its compelling message, to a world full of foreboding, confusion and despair, which had twice in fifty years been bathed in blood, and was again contemplating war—a world gone very far away from Christ.

In the Old Testament, in such times of impending catastrophe, God was wont to raise up prophets, who warned men of what would befall them unless they returned to God. In the ages of Faith, the saints and doctors of the time, fearless men, raised their voices in the land. They thundered and exhorted, and drew the people back from their own destruction.

Now, in 1949, there were prophets also, Catholic priest prophets, whose voices came, not from public squares, but over radios and television. Their tones were rich and pleasing. They warned, too—vaguely and charmingly. Unlike the prophets of old, however, they made no enemies, hurt no feelings. One would never dream of stoning them. And likewise, one would never dream of believing that what they were saying was the entire truth, for they had not the ring, nor the credentials of the holy ones, either of the Old or the New Testaments. They did not drive the people back to Christ. They but added to the confusion!

Now, the time was growing short. The Mother of God had said so, at Fatima, in Portugal. She had said that God's punishments are very close. The people must be prepared. Ah, yes! But how? The voices of the priests were muted. There was no longer anywhere to be found a Saint Paul, or a Saint Athanasius, or a Saint Bernard. There seemed to be nobody with eyes to see, or courage with which to speak.

And then suddenly, on a morning in Holy Week, at a time when those who would have stopped it (as they later stopped news) were so occupied with duties in preparation for Holy Thursday that they were unavailable for comment, there flashed across the radios and newspaper wires of the world the message of salvation, its necessity, and the place where it was to be found.

What other message would men, whose civilization was threatened with annihilation, need more desperately than how they might save their souls? Unfortunately, the priests whose calling it was so to teach men were every day speaking more like members of the Chamber of Commerce (as one non-Catholic Harvard student aptly described it), more like sociologists or psychiatrists, than priests ordained with a divine mission to preach salvation.

After he had fired the teachers, Father Keleher, it so happened, left the city and could not be reached that Wednesday evening by the press. The newspapers did not telephone Bishop Wright, at this time, since the firing of the four professors, as far as anyone could tell, concerned only Boston College. And so the story got out, providentially, and along with it the news that the Roman Catholic Church had taught and defined again and again, in the days before Liberalism, that there was no salvation outside it, nor without personal submission to the ancient Father of Christendom, Christ's Vicar, the Roman Pontiff.

The members of the Center discovered Salvation in the headlines on Holy Thursday morning in various ways. Father Feeney read it on his way to the Center; my daughter, Nancy, and I on our way to Mass. The "four professors", as they came to be called, had been awakened by the newspapers during the night to answer questions about their academic training, their families, the length of their teaching. We found them together at Dr. Maluf's house, in the middle of the morning. A press conference had been scheduled to meet there, for an amplification of the early news. As yet Father Keleher of Boston College had made no reply in the press.

The report of one morning newspaper, the *Boston Post,* for Thursday, April 14th, is similar to that carried in the other Boston papers. The *Post* account read:

> FOUR B. C. TEACHERS
> FIRED AFTER PROBE
>
> College President Discharged Them, They Claim, When They Refused to Retract Statements Made to General of Jesuit Order—Charged Father Keleher with "Heresy" —One of Men is Teacher in B. C. High School—Other Three on College Faculty—Had Been Told Theories They Held Not Approved—Final Action is Immediate

Four columns of the story followed upon these headlines, with a clear statement of the propositions which the teachers had accused Boston College of teaching, in their letter to the General of the Jesuits. The *Boston Post* said:

> The propositions which were accused to the General are—at Boston College are taught both explicitly and implicitly that (1) there may be salvation outside of the Catholic Church; (2) that a man may be saved without admitting that the Catholic Church is supreme among the churches; (3) that a man may be saved without submission to the Pope.

> Efforts to reach Father Keleher last night were unavailing. At Boston College it was reported he would not be at his office until today.

Father Keleher returned before noon on Holy Thursday, and issued a statement. It appeared in the evening papers, and to us it was unbelievable, coming as it did from a Jesuit priest, the president of a Catholic college. The *Boston Evening Globe,* April 14, 1949, carried it in headlines on the front page:

> "They continued to Speak in Class and Out . . .
> Ideas Leading to Bigotry and Intolerance"
>
> B. C. REPLIES TO
> OUSTED TEACHERS
>
> Fr. Keleher Says: "Their Doctrine Is Erroneous and Could Not Be Tolerated"—Instructors Cite Academic Freedom
>
> . . . Father Keleher's statement today was as follows:
>
> "These gentlemen in question were under contract at Boston College to teach philosophy and physics. They had been cautioned by me and others to stay within their own fields and leave theology to those who were adequately and competently prepared.
>
> "They continued to speak in class and out of class on matters contrary to the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church, ideas leading to bigotry and intolerance.
>
> "Their doctrine is erroneous and as such could not be tolerated at Boston College. They were informed that they must cease such teaching or leave the faculty."

The paper went on to state the charge made against Boston College by the four professors:

> The "heresy" . . . lies in the teaching "both explicitly and implicitly" at Boston College that "1. There may be salvation outside the Catholic Church; 2. That a man may be saved without admitting that the Roman Catholic Church is su-

> preme among churches; and, 3. That a man may be saved without submission to the Pope."

Father Keleher's statement revealed many strange things: (1) He perfectly substantiated the accusations of the professors against the teaching of Boston College. He said that the three defined doctrines of the Church (defined by Popes and Councils) were erroneous and against the traditional teachings of the Church. He said they were actually ideas leading to bigotry and intolerance!

(2) Father Keleher denied the liberty of a Catholic to profess his Faith either in class or out of class, and he thereby subscribed to the fallacy of the secularization of religion.

(3) He said, in effect, that the Catholic Faith is not the simple Faith which anyone, learned or unlearned, can know and hold, but, even in its basic substance, it is something which only the specialist can understand and teach.

(4) He brings into serious question the amount of academic liberty allowed by his College to men in the noble profession of teaching.

(5) If, on the other hand, Father Keleher holds, in his heart, the defined dogma of the Church on salvation, but at the same time feels that it is, religiously or politically, not expedient to confess it at this time, then he would be subscribing to the fallacy of "Americanismus". This is the name applied to the false policy against which Pope Leo XIII wrote in his encyclical letter, "Testem Benevolentiae" of January 22, 1899, to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. Pope Leo said, in part:

> . . . For they contend that it is opportune, in order to work in a more attractive way upon the wills of those who are not in accord with us, to pass over certain heads of doctrines, as if of lesser moment, or to so soften them that they may not have the same meaning which the Church has invariably held. Now, Beloved Son, few words are needed to show how reprehensible is the plan that is thus conceived, if we but consider

> the character and origin of the doctrine which the Church hands down to us. On that point the Vatican Council says: "The doctrine of faith which God has revealed is not proposed like a theory of philosophy which is to be elaborated by the human understanding, but as a divine deposit delivered to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. . . . That sense of the sacred dogmas is to be faithfully kept which Holy Mother Church has once declared, and is not to be departed from under the specious pretext of a more profound understanding." (Const. de Fid. cath. c. iv.) . . . Far be it, then, for any one to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over anything of this divinely delivered doctrine; whosoever would do so, would rather wish to alienate Catholics from the Church than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from it. Let them return; indeed, nothing is nearer to Our heart; let all those who are wandering far from the sheepfold of Christ return; but let it not be by any other road than that which Christ has pointed out.

The late Sports Edition of the *Boston Traveler* for Holy Thursday carried across the front page in two-inch, heavy, black headlines a variation of Father Keleher's amazing statement. It read, OUSTED TEACHERS AIDED BIGOTRY.

We were sure that Father Keleher had not made his releases to the newspapers without having been in consultation about the matter with Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright, and we were aware that this extraordinary treatment of defined doctrine came not from traditional enemies outside the Church, but from the Church itself, in Boston.

We had studied for years, at St. Benedict Center, the Fathers and Doctors, the Popes and Councils, of the Church. Our work in Holy Scripture was done from the Greek and Latin. We were studying Hebrew. The whole program was a full-time job, along with theology, philosophy and the history of the Church. Knowing this to be true, we wondered at Jesuits and other priests at Harvard, and similar universities, who were working for advanced degrees in modern science, anthropology, sociology, experimental psychology and other subjects, which left no time for the study of the one truth which every priest is ordained especially to teach. Their sources in history, when they entered that field, we knew to be secular rather than patristic and doctoral. We also knew how little the Fathers and the Doctors were read in Catholic seminaries, colleges, or in private study.

But never, until now, had it come home to us with such force (nor so tragically) to what extent this absorption in secular studies had drawn the priests of our country away from knowledge of theology, scripture, and the history of the Church. It explained the inroads which Liberalism has made into the ranks of the clergy, who, in turn, gave Liberal doctrines to their people.

The accusation of Father Keleher, that the professors' stand on salvation aided bigotry, was tantamount to calling Our Lord, Jesus Christ, a bigot; or St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Thomas, St. Robert Bellarmine, and innumerable Popes and saints. The teachers had taken their three enumerations of doctrine directly from the defined dogmas, and their defense, actually, was pale and unspirited, mild and measured alongside the blazing utterances of the Fathers and the Doctors concerning salvation outside the Church.

If the Church in Boston did not know the doctrine and the history surrounding it, Harvard did. Several times word was brought to us from people at Harvard: "We don't agree with what Father Feeney is saying, but we know he is telling the truth. That is what the Catholic Church has always taught."

On Holy Thursday evening, when Father spoke, the room was filled with students. Father did not talk on the controversy, but on the Passion of Jesus Christ.

XXII

GOOD FRIDAY, 1949. The Center Log has the following entries for the day:

8:00 A.M. We have seen story on bottom front page of *New York Times,* and some accounts in Boston papers. They tell that Father Keleher considers the matter closed with the dismissal of the teachers. There is also a summary of yesterday's news.

2:30 P.M. The Spring issue of FROM THE HOUSETOPS arrives from the binders.

3:00 P.M. HOUSETOPS is taken out to be sold on the streets. A statement is made to the Press. Some of our statements seem not to have been printed.

11:00 P.M. Cable is sent to the Pope. A copy of this cable is enclosed in the copy of FROM THE HOUSETOPS, which is also mailed to the Pope.
The late *Daily Record* (tomorrow's paper) says: "Jesuit head in Rome not to act in B.C. issue."

The *Boston Herald* for Good Friday morning carried the headline: "B. C. President says Teacher Issue Closed with Dismissals." It went on to say:

> The issue involving four lay teachers who trespassed on the field of theology with preachments of a rigorist doctrine which

> the Very Rev. William L. Keleher, S. J., characterized as "contrary to the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church" and "ideas leading to bigotry and intolerance," is closed with their dismissal, the Boston College president emphasized last night. However, the teachers, three from Boston College and the fourth from Boston College High School, expressed confidence that their appeal to Pope Pius XII soon would bring a pronouncement that would "destroy the heresy of liberalism."

There followed a long review of the case, with the statement of the three doctrinal points on salvation, and a new release from the teachers:

> "The issue which motivated us to present our charges in the first place was not a question of nice theological points only for the specialists to discuss, but the very substance of our Holy Faith.
>
> "When we answered questions to bewildered students, it was a matter involving the salvation of souls and a profession of our faith, and any silence or evasion could be nothing less than cowardice and infidelity and betrayal of our faith.
>
> "The side of this issue which concerns us most is the presentation in its entirety and its integrity of our Holy Faith, without which no man can be saved.
>
> "This is not a statement of intolerance or fanaticism, but a simple statement of the Catholic faith, and when this profession cannot be made, Father Keleher's loud pretensions of democracy are a fraud."

The *Herald* goes on:

> In another section of their somewhat lengthy statement they commented that "we are very glad to inform Father Keleher that our doctrinal issue with Boston College has already been placed before His Holiness, Pope Pius XII."
>
> Both Maluf and Ewaskio are well-known to the St. Benedict Center's followers in Cambridge. This center is at 23 Arrow Street, across from St. Paul's Catholic Church and in the heart

> of what frequently is called the Harvard Gold Coast. Lectures there have drawn capacity audiences on virtually every occasion.
>
> Those who have attended lectures at the Center have called them extremely interesting sessions, but with a strong emphasis on a rigorist doctrine.
>
> At the Center last night, Father Feeney sent word through Walsh, one of the teachers, that he had no comment on the developments at Boston College. Asked by a newsman if he was a protégé of Father Feeney, Walsh replied: "I am a friend of Father Feeney."
>
> Father Feeney probably is better known as the author of several Catholic books, one of which, 'Fish on Friday', was a best seller in 1934.
>
> Maluf said one of his uncles, the Rev. Theodorus Maluf, is a Lebanese bishop. Two cousins, Joseph Maluf and Ecclemandos Maluf, are Eastern rite bishops in Lebanon, he said.
>
> Ewaskio became a Catholic two years ago. He received a master of science degree from Harvard in 1943.

We were very busy on Good Friday morning. The newspapers were telephoning, and messages were pouring in. We eventually came to have requests for news of the controversy, or comment upon it, from almost every part of the world. We had letters from Europe, Asia, Africa, India, South America, Central America, Alaska, China, Japan. Where, we asked ourselves, was that hypothetical savage living on a desert island, who had never heard of the Faith? The press and the radio seemed to be able to reach every corner of the universe. And no matter how hard those in power tried to cloud and confuse the issue by raising against us the charge of insubordination and discipline, the people seemed never for a moment to be deceived, at this time. They knew the issue was doctrine, and they asked for an answer, a reaffirmation. We were certain, in the beginning, so serious a matter was it, that millions and millions of people would not long be kept in confusion. Our optimism was misplaced. The Catholic press to the contrary, no trustworthy answer has even as yet been given. It is this tragic condition that gives us so much concern for the souls of those in authority, whose responsibility is a very heavy one.

"Reply to a Liberal", Raymond Karam's answer to Father Philip Donnelly, S.J., comprised the Spring issue of FROM THE HOUSETOPS. We had felt in conscience bound to answer Father Donnelly's attack on the HOUSETOPS, made in his paper, "Some Observations on the Question of Salvation Outside the Church". That this reply of Mr. Karam's should come off the press at the psychological moment when the very question it discussed was before the minds of millions of people was the first of two amazing coincidences. The second coincidence was the release, before this extraordinary week was over (April 14th to the 21st), of the revised edition of the Baltimore Catechism, after twelve years of study on the part of its compilers.

When Mr. Karam prepared his "Reply to a Liberal", he certainly had not the slightest intimation that it would furnish the documentary evidence of the defined dogma in support of which his friends would be fighting and sacrificing their livelihood. The writers of the new Baltimore Catechism could not possibly have known that, eight days before they published their work of twelve years, amid acclaims and acknowledgments, the voice of a Catholic minority in America would be raised in protest: "There are liberal statements in the New Catechism which are contrary to defined doctrine. A catechism is not an infallible document. We beg for a reaffirmation by our Holy Father, speaking *ex cathedra,* of the doctrine on salvation!"

The Spring issue of FROM THE HOUSETOPS had been written for the regular subscribers to the magazine, but now that the controversy had reached the newspapers, we were anxious to get Mr. Karam's article, containing the statements of the Popes, the Councils, the Doctors on salvation outside the Church, into the hands of all who had not had the time or the sources from which to make a study of the question for themselves. At least they would be enabled to verify, to know where to look for the Church's pronouncements on the doctrine.

The Center men, therefore, organized themselves into groups of two or three to sell the HOUSETOPS on the street outside the churches in Boston as the worshippers came out from Good Friday afternoon services. They looked up the City Ordinances for peddling on the street, which, as I remember it, were that wares might be sold on a city street provided the vendor did not stand still in any one spot, but kept moving, and provided he carried on his person whatever posters or advertising necessary to explain his product.

The men were careful to comply with these requirements, and they were at a loss to explain why, a few minutes after their arrival at the various churches to which they had assigned themselves, the police should also arrive. Some of the students were taken to police stations, questioned, and released.

An amusing situation arose at one of the police stations. The officer who had arrested two of the students remembered, apparently, his early Catholic teaching in the days when orthodoxy was the rule, rather than the exception. He took a copy of the HOUSETOPS from Temple Morgan, and opened it by accident at Father Donnelly's article.

"Look at this!" he said, pointing to the page. "See this. It says here that there's salvation outside the Catholic Church. Anyone knows that's wrong. What's the matter with you fellows?"

"We know that's wrong. Read the rest of it", the boys begged him. But the officer was skeptical. He closed the book and led them to the "man at the desk".

Two policemen, arriving at another Church, held a consultation for a minute or two. "There's nothing the matter with these kids", the students heard one say to the other.

"They're nice boys. They're not doing anything." And the officers walked away.

We found later that one of the St. Benedict Center students, thinking it might be the best way to let people know that there was a published answer on the controversy, had telephoned the newspaper offices that men from St. Benedict Center were setting out with the HOUSETOPS, and he told the newspapers where they would be stationed. But this still did not explain the presence of the police at the churches. One paper, on the next day, accused the students, to our great amazement, of "picketing" the churches. In the middle of the account, the newspaper stated the students were selling booklets. This is the first time we ever were aware that selling and picketing were synonymous. It never was the intention of the students to "picket", nor had they done so, any more than the men who visited the Jesuit Provincial in September had "picketed" his residence. The similarity of the epithet made us wonder not too much any more about the source by which the police had come upon the students. This charge of "picketing" appeared in papers all over the country, both Catholic and secular, and Archbishop Cushing used it later on in the *Pilot* in his official promulgation against Father Feeney. We are obliged to say that the charge is completely untrue and unwarranted.

The statement of the *Boston Daily Globe,* Saturday, April 16, 1949, read, in part:

> Churches Picketed
> in Controversy Over
> Ousted B.C. Teachers
>
> A half dozen Catholic churches in Boston were picketed yesterday afternoon by men carrying placards which read, 'No Salvation Outside the Church', in support of the doctrine of the three discharged Boston College teachers . . .
>
> A few minutes after 4, in front of the churches, appeared groups of two, and in some cases three, men carrying placards

> which read, 'No Salvation Outside the Church', and selling booklets entitled 'From the Housetops,' which purports to be a quarterly published by St. Benedict's Center, 23 Arrow St., Cambridge.
>
> There were no demonstrations. The pickets stood silently in front of the churches, placards and pamphlets in hand. The price of the pamphlet was 50 cents. Some were sold.
>
> The two pickets stationed in front of Holy Ghost Chapel, Park St., were brought to the West End Police Station for questioning and later released. They did not return to Park St.
>
> The articles contained in the current issue of 'From the Housetops' support the doctrine of no salvation outside the Catholic Church. The ousted Boston College professors charge they were fired because they were teaching this doctrine at the Heights . . .

Archbishop Cushing's statement, which went all over the world in Catholic and secular newspapers, said, in this regard: "I had also heard that they and a few misguided partisans had been picketing churches and otherwise scandalizing the community during Holy Week." The Archbishop published this without ever telephoning or writing us, his children, to find out if it were true.

We were at a loss, also, to understand why Catholics should be scandalized to receive, on the day which commemorated the death of Him Who died for the salvation of men, the statements of the Church throughout the ages on salvation, especially when a Church leader had the day before, in the newspapers, thrown into doubt these truths. That there was a scandal, we were willing to admit. We were not willing to say that it lay in the lack of observance of conventional procedure. It lay, rather, in the fact that the laity should be forced to take responsibility for clarifying a basic doctrine of the Church, which was becoming hourly more and more confused in the minds of the people because of the evasiveness of the clergy—a basic doctrine which the clergy had been ordained to shout "from the housetops".

I should perhaps add that the men who were selling the HOUSETOPS before the churches had returned but a year or two from the war, where they had seen many a dying comrade who asked for nothing but the assurance that he was going to be saved. Our Lord had said, "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (J. 15: 13.) The Center men had learned the meaning of Our Lord's words. They had fought for freedom and justice and truth on a lesser scale, let us say. They were now willing to fight for these values at their highest level.

When the Faith is fully lived, we reflected in the light of our recent experience, Truth and freedom to profess the Truth are the right of every man. When the Faith goes down, authority, bereft of the Truth it exists to sustain, alone is left. And this authority then becomes an absolute; authority without substance; authority for its own sake. Gradually freedom is replaced, under this regime, with—tyranny.

XXIII

HOLY SATURDAY, April 16th. In its main, front page headlines, the *Boston Evening Globe* carried the following pronouncement:

> Archbishop to Rule on B.C.,
> Says Vatican
>
> Jurisdiction in 'Heresy' Dispute Left to Local Authority.
>
> Vatican City, April 16 (AP)—Jurisdiction in the Boston College heresy controversy will be in the hands of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of the archdiocese of Boston, Vatican sources said today.
>
> These sources said jurisdiction in such cases is always entrusted to local church authorities.
>
> Reports from Newton, Mass., earlier this week said four Catholic educators, dismissed from Boston College because they had accused the college of teaching heresy, had appealed their case to the Pope.

We were filled with consternation when first we read this news, but after a while we realized that the Vatican very probably had no way of knowing that Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing had supported the Jesuit Provincial and Father Keleher of Boston College from the beginning of the controversy (as Father Keleher's testimony in previous chapters of this book will show), and that in turning us over for judgment to Archbishop Cushing they were actually making one of our adversaries our judge! Father Feeney then decided that this was the time for him to come to the defense of the four teachers. There was no point in waiting any longer. And so he released a statement to the press that evening, which statement did not come out in Boston, however, until Monday morning. It read as follows:

> "I was very much surprised to learn from newspaper report that Father Keleher had said that a profession—and where needed, an explanation—of the truths of our Holy Faith, which Father Keleher seems to have relegated to a specialist under the title 'theology', is forbidden any Catholic teacher speaking to Catholic students at a Catholic college. Inasmuch as very few—I might almost say a bare minimum—of the classes are directly concerned with religion and in the hands of what the President calls 'competent theologians', this procedure would leave the principles of our Holy Faith almost totally unmentioned for the greater part of the four-year course of a college boy's life.
>
> "I know many erroneous things that have been uttered by irresponsible teachers in Catholic colleges, but why the three basic premises of Catholic life,—the very direction signs by which one finds it,—should be forbidden Professor Maluf, Professor Walsh, and Professor Ewaskio is beyond my competence to understand.
>
> "As for my personal associations with these three men, and with their staunch associate, Professor Supple of the High School, I am very glad to state what I know to be their qualifications in the matter under which they have been disciplined.
>
> "Charles Ewaskio and James Walsh are both excellent students of theology, to which subject I know they give all their leisure time. Charles Ewaskio is a very devoted student of Holy Scripture, which I know he reads and even memorizes and beautifully expounds, and James Walsh I have heard personally give talks on theological subjects that would do credit to the most trained theologian.
>
> "David Supple, as everyone knows, is one of the most ardent

> lay apostles the Church has in Boston. His readings on the subject of the Faith have been enormous. There is almost no point of Catholic doctrine or program on which David has not a seasoned judgment, expressed with his inimitable grace and ease. Strong faith has a tradition in his family. His two uncles Monsignor Supple and Dr. James Supple, are imperishable memories in the minds of all unequivocal Boston Catholics.
>
> "As for Dr. Fakhri Maluf, I am at a loss to know how to praise him. There is no one who has ever met him who has not sensed in him a positive genius for the things of the spirit, especially in his brilliant theological defenses of Our Blessed Lady as an essential part of all sound dogmatic thinking. His discourses on the *Summa Theologica,* every one of which for the past five years I have attended at St. Benedict Center, puts him, in my measured judgment, as the most brilliant exponent of the true St. Thomas that our country possesses.
>
> "Finally, I may mention Raymond Karam, who was not discharged from Boston College, but who voluntarily left there a month ago in protest against some of the liberal and unpenalized teaching. I do not think after reading his superb article in the current HOUSETOPS, the article entitled 'Reply to a Liberal', that anyone will ever want again to excuse the laity from full competence in the field of theology as it is academically defended.
>
> (signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J."

The next morning, Easter Sunday, one of our students came to us, very much disturbed. He told us that his mother had spoken over the telephone with the Chancellor of the Archdiocese, Monsignor Walter J. Furlong, and that Monsignor Furlong had said to her that "the axe will fall on Monday" (on St. Benedict Center). We couldn't imagine what this might mean, and so we dismissed it from our minds.

The cablegram which we had sent to the Holy Father on Good Friday had referred simply to the copy of FROM THE HOUSETOPS which we were sending him under separate cover. Actually, it had said:

April 15, 1949.

To his Holiness, Pope Pius XII,
Vatican City, Italy.

We beseech Your Holiness, in the name of our patron, St. Grignion de Montfort, to read the defense of Your Holiness' supremacy, for which doctrine we are being persecuted. We are sending this defense to Your Holiness by air mail. It is written by our spokesman, Raymond Karam.

We are Your Holiness' loving children, in the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

St. Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street,
Cambridge, Boston, Mass.

When we realized, from the newspapers on Holy Saturday evening, that the superiors who were aligned against us in the controversy were to be the judges of the orthodoxy of the doctrine we were trying to defend against their Liberalism, we decided to make another appeal to the Pope and the Holy Office. And so, on Easter Sunday evening, the teachers issued the following statement and sent to the Holy Office the following cablegram:

> "We are appealing directly to His Holiness, the Pope, and to the Holy Office, concerning the doctrinal issue between us and Boston College, because we were led to believe that Father Keleher was acting in constant contact with the local authorities all through the case. We cannot conceive Father Keleher taking it upon himself without trial and investigation to pronounce our doctrine contratry to the traditional doctrine of the Church, and summarily firing us, without having consulted His Excellency, the Archbishop.
>
> "We wish to stress the fact that our future and the livelihood of our families are in jeopardy, and we have to act in the quickest and most direct way. His Excellency, the Archbishop, knows from the statements of Father Keleher to the press, and from the theological document by Father Philip Donnelly, S.J., the head of the Theology Department at Boston College,

what doctrine Boston College is teaching. We have submitted Father Donnelly's document, with our reply, written by Mr. Raymond Karam, to His Excellency for his consideration. Our refusal to conform with the doctrine in Father Donnelly's document is the cause of our expulsion from Boston College.

"His Excellency's custody of the Faith and his concern about orthodoxy would justify his taking the initiative against Boston College even without our appeal to him.

(signed) James R. Walsh
Fakhri Maluf
Charles A. Ewaskio
David D. Supple."

(CABLEGRAM)

23 Arrow St.,
Cambridge, Mass.

Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office,
Vatican City, Italy.

For refusing to conform with the following three doctrines taught at Boston College, (1) that there may be salvation outside the Catholic Church; (2) that a man may be saved without confessing that the Roman Church is supreme among all the churches; (3) that a man may be saved without submission to the Pope, Father Keleher, President of Boston College, pronounced that we hold a position which is contrary to the traditional teachings of the Church and which leads to bigotry and intolerance, and has expelled us from our teaching positions. We appeal to your Holy Office this judgment, and request a speedy reply.

Fakhri Maluf
James R. Walsh
Charles A. Ewaskio
David D. Supple

Easter Sunday passed. The next day, Monday, April 18th, proved to be the longest and saddest day in our lives. The story of Father Feeney's defense of the teachers appeared in the morning papers. The *Boston Herald,* under the heading, "Father Feeney Defends Teachers B. C. Fired—Jesuit Deplores Faculty Curb", gave a rescript of Father's statement in support of the teachers. The newspaper account then concluded:

> "The statement was expected to create a sensation in theological circles, not only because of the implied criticism of the alleged lack of religious teachings at Boston College but because of the open scoring of a famed Jesuit's educational and theological problems by another well-known priest."

We spent Monday morning answering telephone calls, receiving telegrams, special delivery letters, and opening an ever-growing mail. Many people seemed to be for us, and as many more against us. We were offered any number of substitute religions! Sometime in the morning, the four teachers had a conference, and decided they would go out to see the Archbishop. They left for Archbishop's House at 11:50, and returned at 2:30 in the afternoon, deeply distressed in spirit. The report of the interview and the conversation following it was substantially as follows:

> "We spoke to His Excellency of the grave injustice done to us by Boston College in placing our future and the livelihood of our families in jeopardy, and in treating us as if we were in heresy, without any process of law or any opportunity for self defense. We brought to his attention the document written by the Reverend Philip Donnelly, S.J., which gave unmistakable expression to the liberal theology taught at Boston College, and we also called attention to our reply to this article of Father Donnelly's by Mr. Raymond Karam. We entreated His Excellency, in the interest of souls, to look into the doctrines taught at Boston College, and to take measures on his own for the protection of the faith. The Archbishop was utterly noncommittal on the doctrinal issue. Although His Excellency told us that he had seen Father Donnelly's article and Mr. Karam's reply to it, he was unwilling to make any statement.
>
> "When we saw that the Archbishop would not assume re-

sponsibility himself, we asked him to present to the Holy See our plea for a clarification of the doctrine, and to advise the Holy Father that a decision on it was urgently needed. The Archbishop merely kept repeating to us that Rome was very slow in deciding such issues. We then reminded His Excellency that the doctrines we were defending had already been defined by the Church, and that the only points in question were the so-called interpretations and additions made by the liberal theologians, which we claimed were in contradiction to the teachings of the Church. If the theologians of Boston College were merely interpreting the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, we asked, why should we be persecuted for professing the dogma? His Excellency did not reply.

"Our interview with the Archbishop was most unsatisfactory. At no point in the discussion did he give us the slightest hint of his feelings with regard to us. We had opened our hearts to him, presenting our grievances as loyal children of the Church to their father. He did say to us several times, 'What do you want me to do? I'll do anything I can for you. But I'm just one poor man.'

" 'No, you're not, Your Excellency,' we told him. 'You are the Archbishop. The jurisdiction of this case rests with you.'

" 'Well, what would you have me do? I'm willing to do anything I can for you.'

" 'Either take the matter into your own hands, Your Excellency, or entreat the Holy Father for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement,' we pleaded with him.

" 'I can't do that', he answered us. 'Sometimes these things drag on for years.'

" 'But, Your Excellency, there has been an injustice done. We've been fired from our jobs, our reputation is ruined, and our families are dependent upon us for support. Over and above all that, there is to be considered the faith of thousands who have been thrown into complete confusion. This is not a matter that can wait for years. Could you promise us, Your Excellency, that you will bring this matter before Rome?

> Would you ask the Pope to reconvene the Vatican Council, if necessary, or to give us an infallible pronouncement?'
>
> " 'Well, we will see, we will see. We will see how it will work out. I don't want to hurt anybody.'
>
> "The Archbishop looked very uneasy throughout the entire interview. He kept pacing the floor, constantly going to a half-open door in the room and looking out. We definitely got the impression that our conversation was being heard by someone else.
>
> "We knelt for the blessing of the Archbishop, which he seemed happy to give us, and we kissed his ring. Then we left."

The teachers finished telling us the story. They looked so solemn that we asked them, "Why are you all miserable? You say the Archbishop was friendly?"

"Yes", they answered. "And he gave us his blessing. And while he did not tell us where he stood on the doctrine, he did seem to wish to be of help."

"Well, isn't all that good?"

"Yes," they admitted, "we suppose it is. But we all have the same feeling of uneasiness about it, somehow. It was a strange interview."

At 4:30 that afternoon, the Press arrived at the Center, to talk with Father Feeney, Mr. Karam, and the teachers. Father confirmed his defense of the professors, during the conference, and St. Benedict Center officially stated that it was behind the teachers also. The Center announced that a copy of FROM THE HOUSETOPS was being mailed to every Cardinal and Bishop, every Patriarch and Metropolitan Bishop in the Church.

"This is a strange way to move into heresy," Father Feeney remarked, "if that is what we are supposed to be doing—to lay our case at the feet of every orthodox person listed in the Church's directory, and to await for one word of reproof on anything we have said." (Not one Bishop has to this day written us a line of contradiction of anything we have said.)

The Center also added that it would like to sponsor a movement in the Catholic world to appeal to His Holiness, the Pope, to reconvene the Vatican Council for pronouncement on the issues involved in the "Boston Heresy Case". The four professors said that they had consulted with His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, for an hour that morning, at the Archbishop's residence, and had made this proposal to him, which he promised to consider.

The portion of this conference which had reference to the reconvening of the Vatican Council was broadcast over the radio at 8 o'clock that evening. At 10:30 o'clock, the Center members departed for their homes, thinking the day was over. Shortly after midnight, the telephone at my home awakened me. It was Dr. Maluf.

"You did not hear the late news?" he asked me. "You did not see the late papers?"

"No", I replied. "Was there something about us?"

"Yes", said Fakhri, gently. "Archbishop Cushing has *silenced Father*. He has put the Center under interdict."

"Silenced Father!" I could not believe it. "But you saw him, just today. He didn't say anything about it. Where did he silence Father?"

"In the newspapers. D. D. Supple saw the headlines on the way home, and telephoned us. Peter Embree [one of Father's Harvard boys] saw them, too, and telephoned us also."

"Oh, Fakhri! Without any warning? In the newspapers? Archbishop Cushing?"

"Yes."

"Is Father with you and the boys?"

"Yes."

"How is he?"

"Terribly shocked. Terribly wounded. But very beautiful."

"Please give him our completest love. We will come right in."

It was, indeed, the saddest day in our lives.

XXIV

THE details of the night of Father's silencing many of us still are not able to face in our memories. Some day we may be able to recall it all without recoil. The suffering of the long hours we sat together, Father with us, until the cold, grey light of a New England April morning came through the windows, is still too keen to dwell on for long.

Father had been wont to tell us many times in his years at the Center that he never had had any doubt of his vocation. Even when fellow members of his Order had come to tell him of their leaving the Order he never had a question of his own vocation, either to be a priest or a Jesuit. He was completely certain of it. In all of the years since his ordination, he had missed saying his morning Mass only when he was too ill to do so. None of us had ever known a priest to whom his Mass meant so much as it did to Father Leonard Feeney. He sang of the Mass in his poetry, paid reverence to it in his stories, lovingly labored at the mystery of it in his treatises. He said of it, in a poem called "After the Little Elevation":

> O wheat-like, white, little, still-as-death,
> Circumferenced Jesus of Nazareth;
> My duty, Your beauty to recondite,
> To fashion You frangible, frail and light.

You come translucent to hold and handle,
To peer clear through, Dear, and see a candle,
With a tractable trait to elate my heart
Who make You and take You and break You apart:—

Yet sever You never, St. Thomas said,
For wetness to water is not more wed
Than these twin fragments I now expand,
In my left, in my right, in my either hand.

The Saints have gazed at in other guise
This Body, ecstatics with other eyes;
But sinners with semblances rest content:
Its measure and mould as a Sacrament.

So daily at dawn, by the grace of Mary,
With well-worn words in a voice I vary,
I give God God, and at God's behest,
For whatever may ease her or please her best.

The last thing any priest would ever foresee for himself, Father faced that night as an actuality. And few priests ever had so much to lose; few priests were ever so loved, in the United States, in Ireland, in England. Few men loved their families so tenderly as he loved his, or had the devotion he had to his spiritual children in Jesus Christ.

Never once, however, did Father think of saving himself at the price of the doctrine. With the help of Her, who was the Queen of priests, if this was the price of orthodoxy, Father would pay it, gladly.

I remember reflecting, during that long night, that two of the saints canonized in our time—St. John Eudes by Pius XI in 1926, and St. Grignion de Montfort by Pius XII in 1947—had incurred the severe censure of bishops. St. Grignion de Montfort was expelled from diocese after diocese in France by Jansenistic bishops. St. Bernadine of Sienna, also, I remembered, was silenced by the Pope, and his followers put under interdict. There finally came a day, however, when St. Bernadine was lifted to the altars of the Church, and pronounced a canonized saint. All the bishops of the East had excommunicated Athanasius. The Pope had signed the excommunication of St. Ignatius of Constantinople, when Ignatius died. The same Pope who had censured St. Alphonsus Ligouri and threatened him with excommunication, lived to present the cause of St. Alphonsus for beatification, nine years after the death of that Doctor of the Church.

I was grateful for the consolation of these thoughts as the boys kept coming in, all through the night, with fresh editions of the newspapers. It seemed as if those enormous black headlines seared themselves into our brains. They varied little:

"Archbishop Silences Priest"
"Father Feeney Silenced by Abp. Cushing"
"Priest Silenced"
"Archbishop Sternly Disciplines Jesuit
in Ruling on B. C. Dispute"
"Catholics Are Barred From St. Benedict's
Directed by Father Feeney"
"Abp. Cushing Indorses College Action
on Ousted Instructors"
"Prelate Acts Due to Jesuit's Support
of 3 Fired at B. C."
"St. Benedict Youth Center Is Under Ban"

Each newspaper gave the entire text of the Archbishop's ruling against us, with the decree, which was as follows: (*Boston Globe,* April 19, 1949)

Text of Decree
on Fr. Feeney

> "Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., because of grave offense against the laws of the Catholic Church has lost the right to perform any priestly function, including preaching and teaching of religion.
>
> "Any Catholics who frequent St. Benedict's Center, or who

> in any way take part in or assist its activities forfeit the right to receive the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Eucharist.
>
> "Given at Boston on the 18th day of April, 1949.
>
> "Richard J. Cushing,
> "Archbishop of Boston."

Father Feeney never received a warning that this was going to happen to him, nor did the Archbishop ever communicate it to him in any way other than through the newspapers. It was not officially promulgated until Friday, when it appeared in the official organ of the archdiocese, the newspaper, *The Pilot*. Canon law prescribes that at least three warnings of such an action be given to the person under censure.

At 6:30 in the morning of our sleepless night, the newspaper reporters came to the Center. They were very sympathetic and kind. One of them, an older reporter, said to Father, seeing how grey and drawn was his face, "None of us likes the personal angle on this this morning, Father. We don't like it at all. Your hardest time, as we see it, Father, will be the waiting period. You are right, and eventually Rome will back you up. You are saying what the Church has always taught." Father explained that one of his greatest concerns at that moment was for his two priest brothers. The same reporter said, "Give us your statement, Father, and we'll have it out on the wires in half an hour. It'll reach everybody you want to reach. This is a personal concern with me." (We have always been deeply grateful to this reporter. We never saw him again, to thank him for his kind and understanding assurance.)

Father gave his statement to the Press. It read:

> "St. Benedict Center,
> Cambridge, Mass.
> April 19, 1949
>
> "The reason I am being silenced is because I believe there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church and without per-

sonal submission to our Holy Father, the Pope, and Archbishop Cushing believes that there is. The reason I am being silenced is because I believe there is no salvation outside the Church or without personal submission to our Holy Father, the Pope, and Bishop John Wright believes that there is.

"The reason I was told to leave the diocese seven months ago is because I believe there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church or without submission to our Holy Father, the Pope, and Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright, then in Europe and managing the affair through others to dismiss me, believe that there is. I cabled twice to Bishop Wright in Europe and once to Archbishop Cushing in Europe and asked for a hearing. That hearing I never received. They have not contacted me at St. Benedict Center during these seven painful months when, in the face of all sorts of gossip and misunderstanding, I remained here at the earnest plea of my students until this doctrinal issue was settled. IT WAS AND IS A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE to me in the sanctity of my priesthood, as I openly declared to every superior I could contact.

"I believe my removal in view of the facts is invalid; the taking away of my faculties was invalid; and I believe the present silencing of me is totally invalid. What humiliation my priesthood, and sympathetically the priesthood of my two brothers, will take because of this brutal action, when I sought to protect four brave Catholic boys in a profession of faith similar to my own, Our Blessed Lady alone knows. I also believe the beautiful Catholics of Boston somehow understand.

"I thank God that a copy of FROM THE HOUSETOPS was able to reach Our Holy Father, every Cardinal in the world, and every Bishop in the United States before Archbishop Cushing and Bishop Wright managed to disgrace me."

In the many columns of reporting which the papers carried about Father, the one which caught Father's spirit as a writer most accurately was a story in the *Boston Globe,* for Tuesday morning, April 19th. It read:

Fr. Feeney
Widely Read
Author, Poet

Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., whose presentation of religious subjects has made him a widely read author and poet, was born in Lynn. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas B. Feeney of 73 Lewis St., Lynn. Mr. Feeney is in the insurance business.

While still a student at the Jesuit House in Weston in 1928, Fr. Feeney's works of prose and poetry presaged for him a brilliant future as a writer.

His book, "Fish on Friday," a humorous dissertation why Catholics eat fish on fast days, was acclaimed in the publishing world in 1934. It was gay reading, according to critics.

Fr. Feeney admits he has fun writing. His books of verse, "In Towns and Little Towns" and "Riddle and Reverie," were done in the same spirit.

"That's the way I like to write—for the joy of it," he said.

Fr. Feeney comes from a family of priests. Two of his brothers are clergymen—Rev. Thomas Butler Feeney, S.J., a professor of English and French at Boston College, and Rev. John Feeney, who is assigned to a Keene, N.H. parish.

Fr. Feeney taught English in the graduate school at Boston College in the early '30s, after his return from Oxford . . .

Fr. Feeney's literary works reflected his interests in everyday occurrences of the ordinary people around him. His sense of humor attracted many friends in all walks of life. One of his staunchest friends was the late Gov. Alfred E. Smith of New York, whose Presidential candidacy was considerably enlivened in the nation's press by a letter written by Fr. Feeney concerning Smith's famous brown derby.

The priest was for many years an editor of America, the Jesuit weekly publication, and one of its most prolific contributors.

When Fr. Feeney's "Fish on Friday" won public acclaim for its witticisms, he commented:

"So many people have the utterly false impression that religious writers or writers on religious subjects must have a

> long face and a solemn, sorrowful approach. That's not the Catholic conception of religion at all."

This same Father Feeney who, even while he had lured the Catholics of America to laughter with his humor and had shared with them his joy, had also led them to love God and His Mother, was now forced to listen, through the seemingly endless day of April 19th, to radio announcers proclaiming the withdrawal of his priestly functions, and the banning of his Center.

"At least", Father said in the late afternoon, "the doctrine gets out each time. Maybe that is what Our Lady wants. And though it is made to look as if I am the only priest in the world who holds it, it is the truth, and the Holy Ghost can fructify it. Many souls will remember it before they die, and many may be saved. We can thank God for that."

At some time during the day, Father's superior, Father Louis Gallagher, S.J., telephoned, to say that this whole thing must be lifted right away. All Father had to do was to go to Holy Cross College at once, and all the censure would be removed. Father was amazed. Going to Holy Cross now would be even more of an admission to the world that the doctrine for which he had fought so hard was wrong. And he would be abandoning now, more than ever, his people who in conscience held the same doctrine.

Center friends dropped in throughout the day. Toward the end of the afternoon, Father requested all who were not registered in the Center School to abide by the ruling of the Archbishop, and not come to the Center any more. He assured them that we would hold them in our hearts and our prayers always. The Center as such was to be closed. Only the School would remain open.

XXV

THERE was no doubt about it,—we were back in the catacombs with a vengeance. We began to realize, the day after Father's silencing, just what life in the catacombs in 1949 would entail in the way of persecution. Shortly after our arrival at the Center in the morning, a friend came to see us. She told us that she had, through a member of her family, come upon the fact of a meeting which had been called for the purpose of organizing a "smear campaign" against the members of St. Benedict Center. Information had been secured about the family of each member, and plans made so that all income would be taken away, in so far as possible, from Center people, and everything done to divide them, one from another. A report that Father Feeney was "mental" was to be sent out everywhere.

"The whole thing is vicious and shocking", said our friend.

"Thank you, dear", said Father. "We are very grateful to you. Now, don't you worry about us, will you? Our Lady is our only protection. We've known that for a long time. And that is the only protection we need."

The truth of our friend's warning came home to us that same morning. Two Center students, Lois Gianescol and Doris Mueller, came to us within an hour, bearing the news that they had been fired from their part-time positions at a Catholic hospital because they were connected with the Center, and would not give up either the Center or the doctrine. A friend telephoned us from New York that the calumny against Father's mental condition had been told to her there by two Jesuits. This false report we finally came to hear everywhere, for the next six months, and we actually read it, once, in a Catholic paper. The ridiculousness of the perpetration of this calumny against Father reached its height one day in a communication Father at long last received from the General of his Order, which attested, among other things, to the fact of Father's sanity. Otherwise it would not have been possible for the General further to discipline Father!

On the afternoon of Father's silencing, Temple Morgan and David Thomson had taken copies of FROM THE HOUSETOPS to various shops in Harvard Square, to be put on sale. There was a great demand for "the other side of the story". The boys had printed placards, which read: "Read 'Reply to a Liberal' in FROM THE HOUSETOPS. St. Benedict Center's Defense of Father Feeney." Within a short time after the magazine had been placed in the Square, the stores began telephoning the Center to say that they had been informed their shops would be wrecked if they did not stop selling the magazines. They all had been threatened.

"What do you mean?" Temple Morgan asked. "Why, you've got every kind of magazine in your store, good and bad, lewd and lascivious. You've got Communist newspapers. This magazine of ours contains only the writings of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. Who told you they'd wreck the place if you didn't take it out, some students?"

"No. The Rectory."

The *Harvard Crimson* finally ran a story on it, on Thursday, under the heading:

> ### Catholic Center's Publication Disappears from News Stands
>
> ### Local Dealers 'Advised' Not to Sell Quarterly Which Contains Feeney-Endorsed Article
>
> "From the Housetops", a quarterly published by the St. Benedict (Catholic) Center on Arrow Street and publicly endorsed by Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., spiritual director of the Center, disappeared yesterday from Square news stands . . .
>
> The magazine was unavailable at all but one news stand in the Square area yesterday. Two dealers reported that a "priest from St. Paul's" had visited them Tuesday night, and advised them to take the publication off their stands, while a third said he had received a phone call from a woman who told him that "a bunch of boys would be over to tear up the books" if he didn't get them out of the shop.
>
> A priest contacted by phone at St. Paul's said that one of the priests connected with the Church had spoken to newsdealers about the sale of "From the Housetops". The cleric, who refused to give his name, said, "we didn't want it around the Square."
>
> The only establishment around the Square selling "From the Housetops" last night was the fruit shop next to the Coop. The manager there stated that no one had complained to him about "any of his merchandise."
>
> The current issue of "From the Housetops" is devoted entirely to an article by Raymond Karam, a student and lecturer at the Center. Karam recently resigned from studies at Boston College, which he accuses of teaching "heresies." In his articles which Fr. Feeney has endorsed, Karam lists 15 errors "in the modern liberal presentation of the Church's doctrine concerning salvation outside the Church." . . .

In that same issue of the *Crimson,* someone had inserted a good-sized ad: "Hear Father Feeney tonight at St. Benedict Center. We stand for freedom of speech." We never found out the source of the ad. That same evening, students stood in the little square before the Center, calling, from time to time: "We want Father Feeney." The *Crimson* related the story the next day:

> Fr. Feeney Cancels Lecture,
> Turns Fifty Students Away
>
> More than fifty people, most of them Harvard and Radcliffe students, gathered outside St. Benedict Center between 8 and 8:30 p.m. last night to hear the Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., but were turned away by Father Feeney himself.
>
> The priest arrived at 8:30 p.m. with Fakhri Maluf, one of the three teachers dismissed from Boston College, and spoke briefly to the crowd. "I want to thank all of you," he said, "for your kind sympathy and understanding, but there will be no meeting tonight. I am extremely sorry."
>
> Shortly after, approximately fifteen people were admitted to the Center. Thursday is the regular night for Fr. Feeney's public lecture and meeting. A sign on the door of the Center announced, 'Closed to the Public, open only to members of the school.' Students of the College who attempted to get in before the arrival of Fr. Feeney were turned away at the door.
>
> A phone call to the Center made earlier in the evening had been greeted by the announcement that a meeting definitely would take place. Nevertheless the janitor of the building, the sign on the door, and Fr. Feeney all maintained the contrary.

Before the week was over, we had become used to being followed on our way to our homes, to threats of all kinds, loss of our jobs, discrimination of every sort. But we also had many and great consolations. Along with a deeper love of Jesus and His Mother, we came to have an appreciation, admiration, and love of each other which must have, even a little, resembled the love the first Christians had for one another. We have beheld in each other, and in our dear Father, acts of heroism, sacrifice, adjustment, and generosity which not only can we never forget, but which have bound us indissolubly together.

On Thursday morning, April 21st, the newspapers telephoned us that the new Baltimore Catechism was to be released the next day. They gave us extensive quotations from it, and we promised them a statement by 4:30 that afternoon. Our comment read as follows:

> St. Benedict Center,
> Cambridge, Mass.,
> April 21, 1949.
>
> In our view, the statement as made by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine on the subject of no salvation outside the Church and holding that persons who remain separated from the Church can obtain salvation under certain conditions, contradicts the dogma which has been defined repeatedly by the Catholic Church, namely, that there is no salvation outside the Church. Any graces given to a non-Catholic are given for the purpose of leading him to the Church.
>
> Due, however, to the confusion of new terms introduced by contemporary theologians, we feel that there is the urgent need for a reaffirmation of the dogma by the living voice of the infallible guardian of the Faith, and therefore, as faithful children of our Holy Mother the Church, we entreat His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, to make an *ex cathedra* pronouncement.
>
> St. Benedict Center,
> By Philip Gammans
> Fred L. Farrell
> Temple E. Morgan
> Howard Cannon
> George Favreau

Father talked over the telephone later in the afternoon to the *New York Herald Tribune,* and made a further statement. This addition of Father's appeared in the *Herald Tribune* on Friday, April 22nd, along with the Center's statement. The *Herald Tribune*'s treatment of the matter was similar to the Boston papers':

Vatican Backs Archbishop in 'Heresy' Case

Experts Call Punishment of Boston Priest Valid; Oppose His Idea of Dogma

By William J. Humphreys

Vatican City, April 21.—Vatican authorities, asked to comment on the Boston College 'heresy' dispute, said today that the Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, had acted within his authority in 'silencing' the Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J.

Vatican sources, without exception, described the disciplinary action as 'valid.' They also took issue with the reported charge that it is 'heresy' to teach that there is salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church. The priests who interpret church policy through endless research in the Vatican archives said flatly that Protestants and others outside Roman authority could enter heaven.

They made this statement after reading carefully the news reports from Boston. These reports said that Father Feeney had been disciplined for supporting three lay teachers dismissed from Boston College and a fourth from Boston College High School. They were dismissed for charging it was 'heresy' to recognize there could be salvation outside the authority of the Pope. . . .

Neither Archbishop Cushing nor Father Keleher made any direct statement on what was the proper doctrine in the controversy.

Last night in Cambridge, a statement by Father Feeney and supported by the four teachers said that "the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine . . . contradicts the dogma which has been defined repeatedly by the Catholic Church, namely that there is no salvation outside the Church."

The statement added: "A dogma admits of no exception. There can be cases that require careful attention to show how

> they fit in the dogma. But a dogma is absolute in its own order and cannot be destroyed by evasions and doubtful terminology.
>
> "Every actual grace given to a person outside the church is given for the purpose of leading him into it. It is only after a man is in the Catholic faith that the rest of his sanctification can go on. Faith is the beginning of salvation.
>
> "The definite impression everyone gets from the statements of liberal Catholic theologians is opposite to that which the dogma intended to convey. This is bad teaching and the Church is intended to teach and teach clearly.
>
> "Due to the confusion of new terms introduced by contemporary theologians we feel that there is an urgent need for a reaffirmation of the dogma of no salvation outside the Church by the living voice of the infallible guardian of the faith. Therefore, as faithful children of Holy Mother the Church we entreat His Holiness Pope Pius XII to make an *ex cathedra* pronouncement."

Our first feeling, on seeing the headlines of this report from Vatican City, was one of alarm. However, we had come to learn not to take too seriously reports purporting to come from "Vatican authorities" or "unofficial Vatican sources". We knew by this time that Liberalism was world-wide, and that it had reached even into the Vatican. We realized it was possible, unfortunately, to have Popes who were Liberal. The one time it was not possible to fear Liberalism in papal utterance would be when a Pope spoke *ex cathedra,* or infallibly.*

---

* A CATHOLIC DICTIONARY, Donald Attwater, Macmillan, New York, 1943, p. 267, Infallibility of the Pope. "The Vatican Council (1870) declared 'it to be a dogma of divine revelation that when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when he, using his office as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, in virtue of his apostolic authority, defines a doctrine of faith and morals to be held by the whole Church—he, by the divine assistance promised him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer was pleased to invest his Church in the definition of doctrine on faith and morals, and that, therefore, such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable in their own nature and not because of the consent of the Church.' Note that this infallibility refers only to teaching concerning faith and morals, and then only when the pope speaks officially as teacher addressing the whole

A Pope might refuse to define *ex cathedra,* and limit himself to encyclical letters and allocutions. And any one of these latter might be suspect of Liberal outlook. But once the Pope pronounced *ex cathedra,* we knew that pronouncement to be divinely protected against error. (An example of this is the famous bull of Pope Boniface VIII, "Unam Sanctam", of November 18, 1302. The whole bull is the preamble to one infallible pronouncement, which is: "Further, we declare, say, *define* and *pronounce* that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.")

Two sentences in the first three paragraphs of Mr. Humphrey's report to the *New York Herald Tribune* also reassured us that the article need not be taken too seriously. The first sentence was:

> "The priests who interpret church policy through endless research in the Vatican archives said flatly . . ."

Now, the Boston heresy dispute did not center around an interpretation of Church *policy,* but rather concerned an interpretation of Church *doctrine.* Doctrine is not subject to Church policy, nor are its safeguards those who make endless research in the Vatican archives and speak flatly to the Press.

The Jesuit weekly *America* was also to confuse this point of doctrine and policy in a day or two with an assertion which was tantamount to saying that the dogma "No Salvation Out-

---

Church with the intention of obliging its members to assent to his definition (and this intention must be manifest, though not necessarily expressed); that neither impeccability nor inspiration (qq.v.) are claimed; that infallibility is personal to the pope and independent of the consent of the Church. This doctrine the Vatican Fathers declared to be 'a tradition handed down from the beginning of the Christian Faith,' that it was implicit (q.v.) in the teaching of the Church up to that time. Infallibility does not by any means do away with the necessity of study and learning, but simply under certain conditions guarantees that the conclusions drawn from study and learning are free from error; the pope's knowledge is not infused into him by God: he gains it just as does any other man, but he is assisted, watched over, by the Holy Spirit so that he does not use his authority and his knowledge to mislead the Church at the times and under the conditions stated above."

side the Church" had held for the Arian, the Pelagian, the Monophysite, the Albigensian and all other heresies up to 1517, but after the Protestant heresy, all was changed. This dogma has a new interpretation "since the Reformation". We knew that this was not true. The very purpose of placing the truths of the Faith into dogmatic form was to guard against the possibility of change or misinterpretation. The dogmas are cast in a dead language (Latin) as a further safeguard against even the change of meaning which a living language might give, in the course of time.

We were, therefore, not impressed with the opinion of "priests who interpret church policy through endless research in the Vatican archives" in so far as they held interpretation of defined dogma which was contrary to the definitions of the Popes and Councils.

The second sentence (in the Vatican City article) which, though it shocked us, also brought us reassurance, was almost humorous. It was:

> "They made this statement after reading carefully the news reports from Boston."

Now, if newspaper report could ever be a legitimate source for a decision on such a serious matter, the Boston reporting of our case—after the first day—was so one-sided that even the reporters themselves admitted as much to us. We were obliged before the summer was over to print a series of six "Reports to the Catholics of Boston", which we sent through the mail to the people of Boston, so that they could have the real story about us. We could not conceive a serious Vatican statement founded on Boston newspaper report.

There were two other paragraphs in the middle of this article in the *New York Herald Tribune,* from Vatican City, which caused us to wonder. The first read:

> "Vatican circles did not regard the dispute as bearing great weight. 'Some people have exaggerated its importance,' said

> one authority. He explained that Father Feeney has the right of appeal but he doubted if the case ever would proceed along the somewhat complicated road to a final decision by Pope Pius XII."

I have no way of knowing what this "authority" would consider as "bearing great weight". By the time this article was written, the whole world was listening for an answer from Rome on salvation. A reporter from the Associated Press had that day interviewed Father for an article he was sending, on request, to Holland. Very reliable sources had told us that everywhere in the world there was demand for more and more news on the subject. Millions and millions of souls were concerned, on the eve of a threatened atomic war, to hear the Church's stand on salvation.

"Not of great weight"? The utterance of truth concerning the salvation or damnation of souls? We wondered what the Apostles, who worked so hard and travelled so far to reach so few, would have said if it had been told to them: "In five minutes, we will hook you up to the whole world. We have caught the people's attention. They are listening. All you have to do is speak to them the words of Jesus Christ on salvation. Those who don't actually hear or read your words, will get the message from the millions who will hear it. Go ahead!"

God thought it bore such great weight, it was so important to Him, that He *died* for the salvation of man.

The second paragraph which caused us to wonder, and which occurred in the middle of the Vatican City article, quoted the same "authority". It read:

> " 'Similar disputes occur frequently,' said the authority. 'Generally, they are settled locally. The Church fixed its teachings on this matter long ago.' This statement apparently was a reference to an allocution by Pope Pius IX. Issued Dec. 9, 1854, the allocution said, 'Those who are ignorant of the true reli-

> gion . . . will not be held guilty in this matter in the eyes of the Lord.' "

The Church did, indeed, fix its teachings on this matter long ago, and much longer ago than 1854. In any event, the matter would not have been fixed by the quoted allocution of Pope Pius IX, since this was in no way an infallible pronouncement—the Pope was not speaking *ex cathedra* when he made it.

This allocution of Pope Pius IX, which is not infallible, is invariably quoted by the Liberals. They seem to base most of their arguments on it. They ignore the fact that this allocution was not the last word of Pope Pius IX on the subject. In 1864, ten years *after* the date of the allocution referred to in the Vatican City article, Pope Pius IX published his famous "Syllabus of Modern Errors". In order that errors of indifferentism, pantheism, naturalism, communism, and other forms of religious liberalism might be stated more distinctly and their condemnation brought home with greater force to men's minds, Pope Pius IX had commissioned Cardinal Bilio to select extracts from his letters, encyclicals and allocutions, in which the condemnation of the errors was separately stated, and to arrange them for emphasis in a series of propositions. On December 8, 1864, the Pope published the *Syllabus,* sending copies of it, together with the Encyclical *Quanta Cura,* to all the Catholic bishops of the world.

The publication occurred two days after he had first made known his thoughts of holding an Ecumenical Council. As Father Alzog, the historian, says, "Between this publication and the convocation of the Vatican Council, men of judgment and ability have professed to find a close and even necessary connection." *

If one were truly seeking his ruling on salvation outside the Church, I do not see how the three following propositions which Pope Pius IX published *without any further qualification,* in his "Syllabus of Errors", could possibly not be considered as his real pronouncement on the matter:

---

* Alzog's Universal Church History, Dublin ed., vol. IV, p. 234.

> *It is error to believe that* "16. Men can in the cult of any religion, find the way of eternal salvation and attain eternal salvation."
> *It is error to believe that* "17. One ought at least to have good hope for the eternal salvation of all those who in no way dwell in the true Church of Christ."
> *It is error to believe that* "18. Protestantism is nothing else than a different form of the same Christian religion, in which, equally as in the Catholic Church, it is given to please God."

The last paragraph in the Profession of Faith, sworn to by Pope Pius IX and every one of the Fathers of the Vatican Council during the Second Public Session of the Council, January 6, 1870, reads:

> "This true Catholic Faith, *outside of which no one can be saved,* which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, PIUS, promise, vow and swear that I will most constantly, with the help of God, keep and confess integral and inviolate until the last breath of my life, and that I will take great care, as much as in me lies, that it will be held, taught and preached by my inferiors and by those who will be placed under my charge. So help me God and these God's Holy Gospels." (The italics are ours.)

Neither an ecumenical * Council nor the Pope defining alone, could ever, by any possibility, proclaim as a dogma a doctrine not contained in Holy Writ and Apostolic Traditions; and the Church, in giving decisions on matters of faith, does not promulgate new doctrines at all, but sets old truths in a clearer light, thus guarding them against fresh errors.† When, therefore, we say that the doctrine "No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church" is a *defined doctrine* we mean that it was actually contained in Holy Writ or Apostolic Tradition, and in defining it, the Church merely set it in a clearer light, and guarded it against future error. When a doctrine is defined, its meaning is put into language so precise and chosen that its signification can never be misunderstood to mean anything else; such as, for instance, the choice of the word *transubstantiation,* to signify the change of the bread and wine, at the words of consecration in the Mass, into the Body and Blood of Our Lord, Jesus Christ. *Transubstantiation,* used theologically, can have no other interpretation.

---

* Oecumenical, ecumenical: general, world-wide in extent, hence an ecumenical council is one to which bishops come from all over the world.

† Substance of the explanation of an Ecumenical Council made by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Germany, meeting at Fulda, at the time of the Vatican Council. The addition of "Pope defining alone" is ours.

Now, when Pope Boniface VIII, for example, declared in his infallible statement in the Bull, *Unam Sanctam,* in 1302:

> "Furthermore, We declare, say, define and pronounce, that it is wholly necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff",

what he was saying, in effect, was that it is an incontestable truth that this dogma was contained either in Holy Writ or Apostolic Tradition (or both) from the earliest days of the Church, and it has to be believed, exactly as it stands, by every Catholic in Christendom under pain of anathema, or excommunication.

Would it be possible, therefore, to conceive of any other Pope, whether in the past or to come, defining, in the face of this infallible teaching of Boniface VIII, that the dogma herein made "even more clear and guarded against fresh errors", was NOT contained in Holy Writ or Apostolic Tradition? If so, it is the end of truth and the whole idea of infallibility. And if infallible statements can never be clear; that is, if we cannot arrive at truth by what the Pope defines, but only through what some non-infallible theologian says about what the Pope defines (the sort of procedure St. Benedict Center is fighting), then Papal pronouncements are of no use. And this is as manifestly untrue as it is absurd.

However, in the light of all we have gone through on this point, and if we could respectfully do so, may we say that we would be grateful to Holy Fathers in the future if they would not tread on thin ice doctrinally. We know that Pope Pius IX has not let us down infallibly—that we know. Papal encyclicals are not infallible, but even in encyclicals the Holy Father should be very careful to make his meaning clear. Because of three or four weak sentences in his encyclicals, Pope Pius IX has left dogmatic utterance unsafeguarded, unprotected, and the only thing the Liberals quote from him are the three or four well-chosen sentences that serve their purposes. It is through ill-will that the Liberals do this, but, again, if we may respectfully say so, Pope Pius IX should have seen this when he made the statements.

Pope Pius IX sensed somewhat that he had spoken occasionally unguardedly, and he decided to make a summary of his writings and allocutions indicating by emphasis his condemnation of modern errors and his own position in their regard, which position was thoroughly and strongly orthodox. His statements on salvation in this summary (the *Syllabus of Errors*) have already been given in this chapter. However, the Liberals paid no attention to the summary. His last will and testament they rejected. It was only his preliminary legacies they took to heart.

St. Benedict Center's reply to the Vatican City article as reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* and the Boston papers was in the form of a cablegram to His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

April 25, 1949.

To His Holiness,
Pope Pius XII,
Vatican City, Italy.

We are scandalized that the Vatican should allow unofficial sources to support the doctrinal heresy in the new

> catechism of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine that there is salvation outside the Catholic Church. For supporting the contrary, four professors were discharged from Boston College and Father Leonard Feeney of the Society of Jesus was silenced by Archbishop Cushing of Boston, at the instigation of his Auxiliary Bishop, John Wright.
>
> (signed) Philip Gammans, for
> St. Benedict Center,
> 23 Arrow St.,
> Cambridge, Massachusetts

We did not receive an answer from His Holiness.

XXVI

FATHER FEENEY had spoken in the Press (the only place he had been given a hearing of any kind) about the invalidity of the procedure against him. He said he had been silenced without any warning, despite the canonical requirement of three warnings.

He now, on April 22nd, four days *after* his silencing, received for the first time an order in virtue of Holy Obedience. It came from Father John J. McEleney, S.J., Provincial of the Society of Jesus in New England, and it read:

PROVINCIAL'S RESIDENCE
297 Commonwealth Avenue,
Boston 15, Massachusetts.
(*Translation from the Latin*)

The 25th day of April, 1949.

To the Reverend Fr. Leonard Feeney, S.J.

In view of your protracted, scandalous and contumacious disobedience, no effect can be hoped to follow from canonical admonitions and rebukes, and therefore we must proceed to a penal precept.

In virtue of Holy Obedience, and under the penalties threatening in Canon 2331 X 1, I order and command you to go to the College of Holy Cross at Worcester within twenty-four hours from the reception of this letter, to present yourself to the Rector of that College, thereafter to comply with his commands, and not to go outside the limits of that College without my express permission.

(signed) John J. McEleney, S.J.
Provincial.
(signed) Edward L. Murray, S.J.
Notary.

(seal)

Father replied to this letter on April 23d.

St. Benedict Center
23 Arrow Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts

April 23, 1949.

Rev. John J. McEleney, S.J.,
Loyola House,
297 Commonwealth Ave.,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Father McEleney:—

My children at St. Benedict Center are now in grave danger, even subject to constant threats of physical violence, due to their championing of a Catholic dogma which you and the institutions under you are denying and for the holding of which they are being persecuted. Under these circumstances, it is my clear duty in conscience as their father, protector and counsellor not to leave them without a shepherd until this dogmatic matter has been settled definitively by official authorities at Rome.

It is also my duty to let the people of America know that no Catholic priest can ever be suppressed the way you have brutally tried to suppress me for upholding a dogma of the Catholic Faith.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
(signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

It was on this same day, April 23d, that the *Boston Herald* announced the forthcoming defense by *America,* the Jesuit weekly, of Archbishop Cushing's action against Father Feeney. The *Herald* quoted the Jesuit article at length. The following

Monday, April 25th, Father received a copy of this issue of *America* (the April 30, 1949, issue, Vol. 81, Number 4) containing the editorial. Attached to the magazine was a note from the Editor, Rev. Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., in which he thanked Father for sending him a copy of FROM THE HOUSETOPS. He added, "Sorry to have to take issue with you, but we tried to do so inoffensively."

We found the *America* editorial an untrustworthy report on every ground. It began:

> "Boston College Case
>
> "On April 18 Archbishop Cushing of Boston publicly announced that Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J. . . . has lost the right to perform any priestly function . . . He also forbade Catholics to frequent St. Benedict's Center . . .
>
> "This drastic action became necessary because of recalcitrance dating back two years on the part of the St. Benedict's group. These Catholics attending various nearby colleges, joined by several teachers and graduate students at Boston College, published (without ecclesiastical approval) a quarterly called *From the Housetops.* They contended that persons dying 'outside the Church' could not be saved. For this and other reasons Fr. Feeney's superiors took action seven months ago, only to meet with defiance. From January 1, 1949 his faculties for hearing confessions were withdrawn."

The number of untrue statements in this last paragraph appalled us. For example, it was not yet a year since the whole Center (on May 2, 1948) had held a procession in honor of the Infant Jesus of Prague on the Archbishop's grounds, in the presence of the Archbishop. It was but a few months over a year since the Archbishop, at the Center, had enthusiastically praised the work of the Center and begged "Father Leonard" to take care of himself, lest "the whole show be over".

The quarterly FROM THE HOUSETOPS was not published by Catholics attending nearby colleges, but by members of St. Benedict Center, studying at St. Benedict Center. And not only was FROM THE HOUSETOPS not published without ecclesiastical approval, but His Excellency, Archbishop Cushing, had himself contributed articles which were published in two issues of the magazine! Before plans for FROM THE HOUSETOPS were put into operation, Father Feeney and the editors had gone out to Archbishop's House, presented the plans to the Archbishop, and received his full approval of them.

Father Feeney's faculties were not *withdrawn* on January 1st. It is true that they were not *renewed* through the ordinary channels, but how did the Editor of *America* know in what manner Father Feeney might have preserved them? And how does one priest dare to attack the sanctity of another priest's conscience in a matter so close to the confessional by way of giving an "impartial" newspaper report in a Catholic weekly?

We were interested to note that *America* admitted that Father McEleney's action against Father Feeney in September, 1948, was for doctrine, in the statement:

> "They contended that persons dying 'outside the Church' could not be saved. *For this* and *other reasons* Fr. Feeney's superiors took action seven months ago . . ."

That the matter was a question of doctrine—on which he requested his right of a *doctrinal hearing*—Father Feeney had always maintained. This was the first time the Jesuits had admitted it, however. Father refused, in conscience, to go to Holy Cross until he had had a doctrinal hearing, thereby incurring censure for what his superiors called disobedience. If there were "other reasons" for Father McEleney's action "seven months ago", Father Feeney, who was directly concerned, had never been told them, and Father Hartnett, whose concern was only of a journalistic nature, had apparently been told them.

We found that Catholic papers all over the country made this article the basis of their own reporting on the case. This last fact caused us to wonder about the ethics of Catholic Journalism. As Father Feeney told Father Hartnett over the telephone, after he had read this editorial, even as a good journalist he expected that before he wrote these "facts" he would have telephoned St. Benedict Center for verification of them.

America's editorial is a very long one. It goes on, after these first two paragraphs, to give the "background" of the "Boston College case" and what Father Hartnett termed the "Church's Teaching". When Father Feeney had read it all he put in a long-distance telephone call to Father Hartnett, and in a few brief sentences, told him how outraged he was to see a Catholic priest and a son of St. Ignatius talking this way to the people of America. Father Hartnett, very ill at ease, asked Father Feeney if he would like him to make any corrections of the statements made about him, in the next issue of *America*. Father Feeney told Father Hartnett that he was not in the least interested in Father Hartnett's personal attack on himself. He was only horrified at the way the most fundamental doctrine that concerns salvation was presented to the people by a supposedly competent theologian.

Later, in a lecture to the students of St. Benedict Center, Father Feeney had this to say of the Hartnett article: "This kind of reasoning", said Father Feeney, "in the sacred field of Dogmatic Theology, by incompetent theologians of the calibre of Father Hartnett, is the greatest scandal there is in the Church in our day, and perhaps one of the main reasons why the National Catholic Weekly, *America*, has been having such a farcical career since it started putting Liberal writers on its staff. There is not an informed Protestant living who, in his heart, does not look upon Father Hartnett's interpretation of the dogma No Salvation Outside the Church, as anything but sheer casuistry and subterfuge.

"All the 'Christianity' of the dogma seems to come from Father Hartnett's kindly presentation of it, for the sake of well-meaning Americans. The 'bigotry' and 'intolerance' of the doctrine is made to come from the way it was originally devised and phrased by the Church. All Protestants in the United States know very well that the Liberal Catholic clergy they are lately reading and listening to, particularly the Liberal Jesuits, are phrasing the teachings of the Church differently for American ears than they were once phrased for European ears by the saints and the doctors of the Church.

"Father Hartnett's method of off-setting the challenge of the dogma: No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church, by means of arbitrary and softly-phrased evasions, is the one method monotonously employed by every Liberal apologete of our day. The Liberal first admits the dogma to be true, calls it a 'basic principle', an 'incontestable axiom', an 'ancient truth', or some such phrase. He then proceeds to present the dogma in a sense that makes the form in which it was originally phrased utterly meaningless. This is what is called the 'charitable' presentation of doctrine, or the adaptation of it to the modern mind. What this dishonesty really does is to kill off the chastity of truth, by reason of the promiscuous manner in which it is presented. This is intellectual license of the wildest kind, and every churchman in the United States knows this to be so."

None of us could hear Father Feeney make this statement and not realize two things: first, how much it cost Father to talk this way, he whose style had always been so kindly and gay; and second, how undeniable was the truth of what he was saying.

The statement which moved Father Feeney to telephone Father Hartnett in New York the moment he finished reading the editorial in *America,* and the statement which St. Benedict Center protests as serious misrepresentation, is this:

> "In fact, the fathers of the Vatican Council taught that an explicit knowledge and profession of the Catholic faith are by no means necessary for salvation . . ."

We do not know what grounds Father Hartnett can possibly have for this teaching of his.

The "fathers of the Vatican Council" is the name given to all of the prelates, be they bishops, archbishops or cardinals, who were present at the Vatican Council. About a year before the Council met, 102 theologians and canonists, chosen from many nations for their learning and experience, came together in Rome to do the preparatory work for the Council. They assembled the material to be placed before the Council for consideration at its sessions. They then arranged this material under various headings, and drew up what were called "draft-decrees" (or "schemata") so that the Fathers of the Council would have all phases of the question which they were about to consider placed clearly and concisely before them.

These theologians and canonists were *not* the "fathers of the Vatican Council", if the *America* editorial had these men in mind, and the "draft-decrees" which they drew up were in no sense offered as authoritative pronouncement. Pope Pius IX himself declared this to be so in his *Apostolic Letter* regulating the order to be kept during the Vatican Ecumenical Council. The Holy Father said:

> ". . . We have taken care to call to this Our Holy City theologians and ecclesiastical jurisconsults from the various regions of the Catholic world, so that, together with other men from this City who are versed in the same disciplines, they might prepare the things which belong to the scope of this general Synod, and so that the way of treating things by the Fathers might thus be made more expedite; We now wish and order that the 'schemata' of the decrees and canons expressed and written by these same men, and which We reserved integrally for the knowledge of the Fathers, these 'schemata' being vested with no approbation from Us, be subjected to the examination and judgment of these same Fathers gathered together in general congregation."

Now, it is a well-known fact that the Vatican Council had time to pass only two Dogmatic Constitutions. These were approved by the Holy Father, and are binding upon the Faithful. These two constitutions are *all* that the "Fathers of the Vatican Council" can truly be said to have taught. There is no mention in either of them of the doctrine which Father Hartnett says is the teaching of the Council.

If Father Hartnett is referring to the "draft-decrees" drawn up by the theologians before the Council met, surely he must know that these "drafts" were entirely without authority and were in no way the work of the prelates officially known as the "Fathers of the Vatican Council". We could show from the "draft-decrees" not voted upon at the Council how much more the theologians who prepared the "schemata" of the Vatican Council were minded to support the doctrine *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus* (Outside the Church there is no salvation) than they were to provide support for the Liberal innovation. However anxious Father Hartnett and his auxiliaries were to interpret some of the preliminary transactions of the Vatican Council in their own favor, we believe it was theological foul play to present preliminary discussions as though they were final teachings in a matter of such sacred importance.

That an American Catholic priest should do this—and without public rebuke on the part of his superiors, or public correction so that the people might not be deceived—constitutes grave betrayal of the Faith.

XXVII

ON APRIL 26, 1949, eight days after his silencing Father Feeney received his first canonical warning from the Provincial of the Society of Jesus, Father John J. McEleney, S.J. It was written in Latin, and Father again was charged with disobedience, and again his appeal of conscience was ignored.

Two days later, on April 28th, the first Center couple scheduled to be married, after the interdicting of the Center, were refused the Sacrament of Matrimony. The banns for their marriage had been read in church, and all the requirements had been fulfilled. To their great distress, and the distress of those who loved them and had come to witness their wedding, they were told they could not be married. Their disappointment was so keen that Mr. Fred Farrell asked permission to telephone the Chancery Office and speak with the Chancellor, Monsignor Walter J. Furlong.

"I understand, Monsignor," he said, "that it is by your orders that marriage is denied this Center couple. The Archbishop's decree on the Center as published in the newspapers (and that is the only notice of it we have been given) mentioned the two Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist only. We have, as you know, appealed this to the Holy Father and the Holy Office. Are our people to be unable to marry, in the meantime?"

"Until you come up here and submit, and renounce St. Benedict Center, I do not care to have a discussion with you."

"Our friends cannot be married today, Monsignor?"

"No."

"But this was not in the promulgation against St. Benedict Center."

"Then I promulgate it now."

"Over the telephone? But you can't do that, Monsignor!"

There was no reply. Monsignor Furlong was no longer listening. The bridal party, so full of joy a short time before, walked sadly out the door of the rectory.

That evening, Dr. Maluf and Mr. Philip Gammans set out for Washington, to see the Apostolic Delegate, His Excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani. They took the night train, and arrived in Washington on the morning of April 29th. They went immediately to the Archbishop's residence, and were received by his secretary, Monsignor Carroll, who took their names and asked them to wait in a side room. He knew who they were, and had read about the "Boston Heresy Case" in the newspapers.

Monsignor Carroll brought back word that Archbishop Cicognani would not see Dr. Maluf and Mr. Gammans, but that they might leave a message with him for the Archbishop.

"We would be most grateful if we could see His Excellency", Dr. Maluf said. "We have come on a long journey to talk with him, at a time when we are upset and need very much to talk with the Holy Father's representative in our country. Is there no hope at all that we might see him, if only for a few moments?"

"I'm afraid not", Monsignor Carroll answered. "You have, as I understand it, written to the Holy Father yourself. This is the right of every Catholic, when a question of doctrine is concerned. Was there something further you had in mind?"

"There are several things further. Yesterday the Sacrament of Matrimony was refused to two members of our school. There was no mention of this Sacrament in the promulgation against us. This new measure was 'promulgated' suddenly over the telephone yesterday at the very time our students were to have been married. We would like to make a statement of this and other things to Archbishop Cicognani for submission to Rome. We would like to have some word on it from His Excellency. We have been fighting to uphold the dogmas of our Faith, and have been unable to secure a hearing on these doctrines from any of our local superiors."

Monsignor Carroll was sorry. It would not be possible to talk with the Apostolic Delegate. The very best thing to do would be to write him a long letter and tell him the whole story that way, and that could be done from Boston as well as from Washington.

Philip Gammans and Fakhri Maluf looked around the coldly beautiful room and into the face of the monsignor before them. They realized the Pope's vicar was on the floor just above them. Someone upstairs had addressed him, and his voice was heard at the head of the stairs in answer. The Center men had travelled all night, hundreds of miles, to get Archbishop Cicognani's word, whether approving or disapproving. They had been fighting what they believed to be the Pope's cause, and they had come to the Apostolic Delegate for the paternity which had been refused them at home—to him because he was the direct representative of the Father of Christendom. They were finding, instead, the same legal aloofness, lack of simplicity, absence of candor; the same political caution that prevailed in Boston.

"Yes", they told Monsignor Carroll. "We can go back to Boston, and we can write a letter. Thank you for your time. Good-bye, Monsignor."

They caught the next train, and reached the Center that night, a little before midnight. The following day they wrote a very long letter to His Excellency, Archbishop Cicognani, giving him the history of the work of the Center, the events leading up to the dismissal of the four teachers by the Jesuits, the silencing of Father Feeney, and the interdicting of St. Benedict Center. The letter closed:

> "We wish to emphasize that this most serious and most drastic action, endangering the prestige, the good name, and the very existence of our school, our magazine, and our apostolic work among students was done without any investigation, without any determination of our side of the question, was done without ever allowing St. Benedict Center a hearing or a defense. It is publicly known that the only reason which motivated the Archbishop in his action is our profession of doctrines defined by the Church, and which, for considerations of a temporal nature, Archbishop Cushing is anxious to keep unprofessed.
>
> "It is very clear to us as a matter of conscience that no measure on the part of the Archbishop could deprive us of our right and duty to profess our Catholic Faith in its entirety, and our absolute loyalty to our Holy Father, the Pope. Since, as Your Excellency knows, our doctrinal issue is being considered by the proper authorities at the Vatican, we are appealing to you to use every power at your disposal to remove the effect of the proclamation of the Archbishop which has placed several Catholic institutions in jeopardy and endangered the livelihood and the happiness of many families of the faithful until the underlying doctrinal issue is definitively settled by our Holy Father, the Pope.
>
> "We are Your Excellency's faithful servants in Christ.
>
> (signed) Philip Gammans, Fred Leonard
> Farrell, Temple M. Morgan,
> George O. Favreau, Howard Cannon,
> for St. Benedict Center."

After a month had gone by and we had received no answer to this letter, Dr. Maluf telephoned the office of the Apostolic Delegate, in Washington. He was again referred to Archbishop Cicognani's secretary, Monsignor Carroll, who told him that a letter *had* been sent by His Excellency to St. Benedict Center.

Dr. Maluf assured him that we had not received it, and Monsignor Carroll said he would see that a copy of it was mailed to us. In the meantime, he added, he could reiterate a portion of the letter—which was to the effect that Archbishop Cicognani had not answered at once since he hoped that we would have reconsidered our position in relation to our legitimate ecclesiastical superiors.

"We explained to you, Monsignor," Dr. Maluf replied in dismay, "that it isn't a question of our being unwilling to deal with our local superiors. *They* have consistently refused to give *us* a hearing. Now they tell us they will listen to us only when we come to submit, but on all things else they will have no discussion with us. Were we to submit, that submission would be considered by everyone as a doctrinal yielding. It would be a denial of what we know to be the defined dogmas of the Church. Would His Excellency wish us to do that? Which of these infallible dogmas does he wish us to deny?"

"I cannot go into a discussion of that over the telephone", Monsignor Carroll answered. "I will see that His Excellency's letter is forwarded to you."

The letter arrived in a day or two. It was as follows:

APOSTOLIC DELEGATION
United States of America

3339 Massachusetts Ave.,
Washington 8, D.C.

May 17, 1949.

Mr. Philip Gammans
23 Arrow St.
Cambridge 38, Mass.

Dear Mr. Gammans:

I wish to acknowledge the letter of April 30, 1949, signed by yourself, Mr. Fred Leonard Farrell, Mr. Temple M. Morgan, Mr. George O. Favreau and Mr. Howard Cannon, as the Board of Directors of St. Benedict's Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

> I did not answer this letter sooner as I wished to secure further information and because I hoped that in the meantime you might find reasons to reconsider your position in relation to your legitimate ecclesiastical superiors.
>
> In reply to your letter I wish to state clearly that I am without power to act in the case as the entire matter is now reserved to the Holy See. The decision of the Ordinary of the Archdiocese of Boston stands and your letter is being forwarded to the Vatican.
>
> Sincerely yours in Christ,
> (signed) A. G. Cicognani
> Archbishop of Laodicea
> Apostolic Delegate
>
> *P.S.* This is an exact copy of the letter sent to Mr. Gammans on May 17th, 1949, and is being sent on June 1st, 1949, at the request of Dr. Maluf.
>
> (signed) D. M. Carroll
> Secretary.

A great deal had happened to us by the time this letter reached us. We were finding out every day how lightly doctrine was protected in the Church in our time; indeed, how little doctrine seemed to matter. As we were called on for courage and strength in our own defense of dogma, we came to realize we had but one source from which we could be sure of support and warmth and love in our fight. That source was the Eternal Father, through the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The fierce need we had felt in the beginning for the comfort and sustenance of our ecclesiastical superiors in America grew less, as we came to know that whatever fire they had had for the Faith was there no longer. We had grown to expect nothing, and so Archbishop Cicognani's letter was not a disappointment to us. We had come to look for our strength entirely from within ourselves. When we have received support from without, in these last six months, we have been deeply grateful. But we no longer expect it.

The newspaper comment at this time was interesting. *The New York Times* for Monday, May 2, 1949, carried the following:

> Papal Bull Quoted
> On Salvation Issue
>
> Word of Boniface VIII in 1302
> Held by Dr. Bonnell to Back
> Ousted Catholic Teachers
>
> A papal bull, 'Unam Sanctam,' issued by Pope Boniface VIII in 1302, was quoted yesterday morning in a holy communion meditation by the Rev. Dr. John Sutherland Bonnell at the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church at Fifty-fifth Street, as apparently supporting the position of the Roman Catholic lay teachers dismissed recently at Boston College.
>
> Three were members of the college's faculty and a fourth taught in an affiliated high school. The Very Rev. William L. Keleher, S.J., president of the college, declared that they had been teaching 'ideas leading to bigotry and intolerance.'
>
> The teachers said they had objected to having students at the college taught that there may be salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church and that a man may be saved without submission to the Pope and without acknowledging the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church among churches.
>
> The papal Bull quoted by Dr. Bonnell as "one of the most important of all papal declarations," reads:
>
> "Now, therefore, we declare, say, determine and pronounce that for every human creature it is necessary for salvation to be subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff."
>
> "This papal Bull, so explicit, so definitive, has been made a part of the Roman Catholic canon law," Dr. Bonnell said. "And, in the light of this declaration, it seems that the dismissed lay teachers have some very powerful documents to quote on their side.
>
> "Protestants are especially impressed by the explanation given by Father Keleher, president of Boston College.
>
> "Discussions within the Roman Catholic Church as to who

> can be saved outside its boundaries, are, of course, of interest to Protestants, since we compose the majority of the people concerning whom the controversy has arisen.
>
> "Protestant interest in this question is largely theoretical, however, since millions who profess the Reformed faith will sleep just as soundly in their beds at night, even if it had been decided by the Roman Catholic hierarchy that they are all doomed to utter darkness . . ."

Father Feneey had received still another letter from Father McEleney, on April 30th, asking him to come to the Provincial's Residence on May 3rd, to answer questions with regard to his "long standing disobedience". Father replied to this letter on May 2nd.

May 2, 1949.

Very Rev. John J. McEleney, S.J.,
Loyola House,
Commonwealth Avenue,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Father McEleney:—

I have repeatedly conveyed to you in previous letters that I have a very grievous matter of conscience, which matter you have consistently refused to respect.

I can now say that I believe that you personally are in heresy, and that your policy is one of persecution of those who profess the Catholic Faith in its entirety, and I am convinced that submission on my part to any commands or precepts proceeding from you in my regard can only lead to the scandal of souls who would be in any way touched by your influence.

I am now proceeding to appeal to Father General for a determination of orthodoxy between you and me, and I will not be able to have any further contacts with you until the decision of Father General is known.

Yours sincerely in Christ,
Leonard Feeney, S.J.

Father then wrote to the General of the Society of Jesus.

St. Benedict Center,
23 Arrow Street,
Cambridge, Mass.
May 2, 1949.

Very Rev. John Baptist Janssens, S.J.,
General of the Society of Jesus,
Borgo Santo Spirito 5,
Rome, Italy.

Your Paternity:—

I am shocked at the way the appeal to you of the Boston College teachers has been handled. It has meant a scandal to the Faith in this country and my silencing as a priest, and the leaving of me totally unprotected by my Order, while fighting to protect our Holy Faith. I beseech you to investigate at once the orthodoxy of Father McEleney, his dealings with Bishop Wright and Harvard University, and also the orthodoxy of the men he has put in power in the New England Province.

If Your Paternity does not do this it means the ruin of the Faith in this country, due to the negligence of our own Order. Every detail of my supposed disobedience will be explained to you when this doctrinal issue is settled.

I am your faithful son in Jesus and Mary.

(signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

That afternoon Evelyn Uberti came to see us. Evelyn's experience at Emmanuel, the college to which she transferred after her resignation from Radcliffe, had proved similar to that of the boys who had transferred to Catholic colleges. She told us about it again that afternoon.

"I transferred to Emmanuel in order to get certitude and the Faith", Evelyn told us. "Instead, I found secularism, liberalism and confusion. My religion course was so liberal I was obliged to drop it, or spend my time taking issue with the professor—who, by the way, is also professor of philosophy at St. John's Seminary, in Brighton. I hope St. John's is not as confused as Emmanuel on the subject of salvation, the way Father Meehan teaches it. Doris Coulombe, who has been trying to defend the doctrines on salvation with me, told me that Father Meehan spent the entire religion period today talking on salvation. He now says that Father Feeney's theology is correct. However, there are two views on the subject, 'the rigid and the lenient'. He himself prefers to take the latter—at least until it has been defined one way or the other. A student offered the objection that the doctrine had already been defined, but Father didn't take any notice of her. It's a state of complete confusion, and all the students know that the last place in the world to find confusion should be in the doctrines of the Church. The faculty won't discuss it, and they have warned the students not to talk about it with Doris and me. It's too bad. I wish there were something we could do about it."

Evelyn Uberti and Doris Coulombe found there *was* something they could do about it. On May 19th, their final examinations over and their Commencement invitations ready for mailing—two weeks before they were to receive their degrees—they came to St. Benedict Center and told us that they were resigning from Emmanuel College and refusing to take their degrees. Their academic caps they placed on the altar of the Infant Jesus of Prague, and their gowns they hung in the Center closet. The next day *The New York Times,* of Friday, May 20, 1949, had this to say of it:

> Cambridge, Mass., May 19 (UP)—The "heresy" dispute that resulted in the discharge of three Boston College instructors and the silencing of a Jesuit priest recently, flared anew tonight when two girl students at Emmanuel College resigned and refused to take their degrees.
>
> Miss Evelyn J. Uberti, 22 years old, of Waltham, Mass., and Miss Doris Coulombe of Brookline, Mass., both seniors, said Emmanuel was teaching the same doctrine that caused the previous dispute, that there is salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church.

> "I've known in my mind for some time that Emmanuel was teaching heresy," Miss Uberti said, "but it wasn't until recently that I realized that if I accepted my degree I would be supporting their teachings."
>
> She said she and Mis Coulombe had submitted their resignations to Sister Helen Madeleine, dean of Emmanuel, and told her they didn't want the degrees they were scheduled to receive June 7th.
>
> Miss Uberti, who headed the dean's list at Emmanuel, said she transferred there last year after three years at Radcliffe College. She said she knew of the "heresy" before the Boston College dispute broke out, but that the stand of the three discharged instructors led her to believe she should publicly profess her faith.

The *Boston Post,* for Saturday, May 21, 1949, carried the following story:

> FIVE QUIT
> 2 COLLEGES
> ON 'HERESY'
>
> Leave Boston College
> and Holy Cross
> in Dispute
>
> Revelation that four Boston College students and a Holy Cross student have resigned from their classes within recent months because of what they termed teachings "contrary to true doctrines," was made last night.
>
> The five men, now enrolled in classes at St. Benedict Center School at 23 Arrow St., Cambridge, made the disclosure after two Emmanuel College students submitted written resignations to Dean Sister Helen Madeleine.
>
> The former Boston College students include Thomas Mulcahy, 21, of 10 Grove St., Lynn, a sophomore student in the Greek honor class who resigned in January, and Joseph Roche, 21, of 90 Putnam Ave., Cambridge, also a sophomore, who resigned after four Boston College instructors had been discharged for alleged teaching of heresy.

> Others were Raymond Karam, 23, of 90 Putnam Ave., Cambridge, a student in the graduate school at the time he resigned in February, and Brendan McGovern, 20, of 52 Alleghany St., Roxbury, a sophomore, who said he quit the institution in September, 1948, because he was opposed to the teaching that there is salvation outside the Catholic Church.
>
> Robert Colopy, 22, who was a senior at Holy Cross College, said he resigned in February because his beliefs differed from those taught at the Worcester institution. Colopy would have received his degree next month.
>
> Since tendering their resignations, the five men have been regularly attending classes at the Cambridge centre on which a ban was placed against the attendance of lectures by Catholics by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing. The ban was placed on the centre after the Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., was relieved of his priestly functions by Archbishop Cushing.
>
> Evelyn J. Uberti of 15 Richgrain Ave., Waltham, and Doris M. Coulombe, of 1382 Beacon St., Brookline, both 22, submitted written resignations to Emmanuel College yesterday. Both girls were members of the senior class and were to be graduated on June 7.

Evelyn Uberti and Doris Coulombe asked to be registered in the Center School for the summer term. Doris, who had been engaged to Tom Sennott for over a year, planned to be married on July 2nd. She sat in on the Center classes during the day, and went happily on with her preparations for her wedding.

XXVIII

SALVATION again came into the headlines when Doris Coulombe and Tom Sennott were refused marriage in the Catholic Church. *The New York Times,* Saturday, May 28, 1949, reported the story:

> Priest Bars Bridal
> In 'Heresy' Dispute
>
> Engaged Woman Student Quit
> Her College in Protest on
> Church 'Salvation' Case
>
> By John H. Fenton
>
> Cambridge, Mass., May 27—The Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., publicly deprived of his priestly duties a month ago in the Boston College "heresy" case, said today that he had appealed to the Most Rev. Amleto Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, in a new incident involving a student at Emmanuel College, a woman's institution.
>
> The Rev. Thomas Dwyer, a curate at the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Everett, Mass., refused permission for the student, Miss Doris M. Coulombe, 22 years old, to marry.
>
> She and a classmate, Miss Evelyn J. Uberti, also 22, of Waltham, Mass., had resigned from the college, saying they could not accept degrees from a Roman Catholic institution

> that held to the doctrine that there could be salvation outside the church. Both were seniors and scheduled to be graduated in two weeks.
>
> Miss Coulombe and her fiancé, Thomas H. Sennott, of Arlington, laid their case before Father Feeney, who promised his support. . . .

St. Benedict Center had, on the afternoon Doris was refused, sent a night letter to the Apostolic Delegate:

> Cambridge, Mass.,
> May 26, 1949.
>
> His Excellency, Most Rev. Amleto G. Cicognani, D.D.,
> 3339 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.,
> Washington, D.C.
>
> Local ecclesiastical authorities once more refused matrimony to two members of St. Benedict Center School. We request your personal intervention to remove this outrage against justice and this act of persecution against those who profess doctrines of the Catholic Faith and the necessity of loyalty to the Holy Father for salvation. Popular indignation is high. Request speed in responding to our pleas.
>
> (signed) The Members of St. Benedict Center.

During the week following their visit to Doris' parish rectory, Tom and Doris tried frantically to do everything in their power to secure the publishing of their marriage banns in their churches. It is a rule of the Church that banns of marriage must be read at Mass for three Sundays before a marriage takes place, both in the parish church of the bride and in the church of the bridegroom. The *New York Herald Tribune* for June 2, 1949, reported at length on the visit of Tom and Doris to the Chancellor of the Archdiocese.

> Boston, May 31 (AP)—A young Roman Catholic ex-G.I. student who has taken sides against the Boston archdiocesan authorities in a controversy on church doctrine said Tuesday that the chancellor of the archdiocese had denied him and his

> intended bride permission to wed with the church's blessing.
>
> Thomas H. Sennott, 26, said he and his fiancee, Miss Doris M. Coulombe, 22, accompanied by James R. Walsh, ex-Boston College teacher, went to the Chancery office to request church rites for their marriage. . . .
>
> There, according to Mr. Sennott, Miss Coulombe and Mr. Walsh discussed the issue with Monsignor Walter J. Furlong, the Chancellor.
>
> "Unless you sever your connection with St. Benedict Center you cannot be married," Mr. Sennott stated his fiancee and Mr. Walsh were told by the priest.
>
> "Of course," Mr. Sennott added, "we have no intention of doing that."
>
> Monsignor Furlong withheld comment. No church official has made any comment on the subject.
>
> The couple said they would not be married outside the Church. . . .
>
> After the conference with Monsignor Furlong Tuesday, Mr. Walsh said his group was resisting what he contended was an attempt by diocesan leaders to divide the controversy into two issues, doctrinal and disciplinary.
>
> Mr. Walsh said the disciplinary question "sprang directly from the doctrinal question and is a part of it."
>
> He said his group was confident that the highest church authorities in Rome would support the group here in its contention that there was no salvation outside the church.
>
> Thus far, he contended, Pope Pius XII had rendered no decision on the question. The only reported Vatican utterance on the Boston controversy, he said, had been that of an unofficial Vatican spokesman who was reported to have said such cases of dispute are within the jurisdiction of local ecclesiastical authorities.

Doris Coulombe is slender, soft-voiced and gentle; and very lovely to look upon. As her wedding day approached, with no word from the Apostolic Delegate, she grew very wistful. Tom Sennott, her fiancé, had won highest award as the honor student of his year at Boston College. He had a distinguished record in the army, and after the war had been studying architecture at the Institute of Design at Chicago. Tom became every day more indignant at the treatment he and Doris were receiving.

When finally July 2nd arrived, Tom and Doris went out to see the Archbishop. They had an idea that if they told him it was their wedding morning, as they had planned it a long time ago, he might relent. At least, they thought, the Archbishop on this day of days would listen to them, if only for a few moments, while they told him how they felt about the doctrine of the Church. They were sure that when they had explained everything to him, he would understand and things would be all right.

It has always been the strictest rule of the Church never to prevent marriage between two people when there is no diriment impediment. Even in proscribed countries, like Czecho-Slovakia, the Pope would not refuse to let a Catholic girl and a Communist boy marry, when whole sections were under interdict at the order of the Holy Father, himself. Monsignor Furlong, the Chancellor of the Boston Archdiocese, had been empowered by the Archbishop of Boston to hold, over one group of loyal Catholics in the United States, the most arbitrary powers, extending even to marriage.

As Tom and Doris stood waiting in the entrance hall of Archbishop's House, they saw His Excellency at the end of the corridor. Impulsively, they went to him. They found he was alone, and gratefully and hurriedly they began to pour out their story. His Excellency stopped them, and refused to listen. They were to leave at once, he said angrily. "You started your business at the Chancery office", he said, "and you'll have to finish it over there."

They came back to the Center. Earlier in the week they had obtained their marriage license and a five-day waiver in the hope that the Archbishop would allow them to marry on their appointed day. St. Benedict Center, knowing that they could not give up the doctrine, and desperately desiring the happiness of two of their members, telephoned the Archbishop, and were told that he had left for an appointment. They received the same report all through the afternoon, and finally, at dinner time, they set out in several cars, taking Tom and Doris with them, for Archbishop's House. They were again informed that His Excellency was not at home, and it was suggested that they go to the Chancery. Unsuccessful once more at the Chancery, they returned to the Archbishop's residence. It was quiet and cool and very beautiful in front of Archbishop's House. A long, green lawn sloped down from the rise of ground on which stood a life-size statue of the Sacred Heart, with outstretched arms. The faculty and students of the Center told the person who answered the door for them that they had decided to wait for the Archbishop's return. They went over to the statue and knelt around it, and began to say the rosary.

The Center members remained there, for almost three hours. There speeded up to the door of Archbishop's House, after the prayers had been going on for a few minutes, a police cruising-car and a police motorcycle. A police sergeant, hands on hips, stepped in front of the kneeling figures, and began alternately to threaten and importune. Officers took positions around the group. The Center continued to recite the rosary, heedless of what went on around them. After a little time had gone by, two of the officers removed their hats, and stood reverentially as the prayers went on. One of them remarked, "These kids aren't getting a very good deal."

The Center had been praying for over two hours when the Boston Police Commissioner, Mr. Sullivan, arrived and was admitted to the house. The *Boston Globe* cameraman and reporters from the local newspapers had been there for the whole evening. After holding a conference, apparently, with members of the Archbishop's household, Mr. Sullivan finally came out and told reporters that he would permit the group "to pray all night if they wanted to". A short time after this a priest announced that the Archbishop would not return that evening.

The word was brought to Tom and Doris. The Archbishop would not come out.

"It's a big disappointment, not being able to go through with our marriage today," said Doris Coulombe, her voice and face showing signs of strain and fatigue, "but the biggest disappointment is that the Archbishop is not stating the true doctrine of the Church. He is dodging the issue."

"And he will not face us, his children", said Jim Walsh.

It was five minutes before ten. The thirty-six members of St. Benedict Center formed a column, two abreast, and walked down the long driveway to the street, entered their cars, and drove to the Center.

Three weeks later, Doris Coulombe and Tom Sennott wrote to the Rota:

July 26, 1949.

Very Rev. Monsignor Andrew Jullien,
The Sacred Roman Rota,
Palazzo della Dataria,
Citta del Vaticano, Italy.

Dear Monsignor Jullien,

We the undersigned, Doris Coulombe and Thomas Sennott, wish to present to your Sacred Tribunal the following appeal: On July 2nd of the current year, the day appointed for our reception of the Sacrament of Matrimony, we were refused our right to the Sacrament by the Right Reverend Monsignor Walter J. Furlong, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Boston. There was on our part no intrinsic impediment to the Sacrament of Matrimony.

As the condition for a withdrawal of his rejection, Monsignor Furlong required of us that we renounce publicly St. Benedict Center. St. Benedict Center, which champions the doctrine that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church and that personal submission to the Holy Father is necessary for salvation, has already appealed to the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office and to His Holiness, the Pope, its doctrinal controversy with the Archdiocesan authorities in Boston, who are laboring to suppress every organization professing the aforesaid doctrine. The appeal has not yet been answered.

We cannot in conscience renounce St. Benedict Center. Under the circumstances and the wide publicity which our case has received, such a renunciation would be tantamount to a denial of defined doctrines of the Catholic Faith.

We beg you for an immediate answer because our marriage has already been delayed several weeks on account of this action on the part of the Chancellor. Is the Chancellor of Boston within his rights in denying us, under these circumstances, the right to be married according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church?

We are, Reverend Monsignor, your humble and faithful servants in Jesus and Mary,

(signed)
Thomas H. Sennott
Doris M. Coulombe

Six months have gone by since Tom and Doris sent their appeal, air mail and registered, to Monsignor Jullien. The registered mail receipt has long since been returned by the Post Office, but no acknowledgment of their letter has come to Tom and Doris from Monsignor Jullien. There are six engaged couples at St. Benedict Center, awaiting word that they may marry in the Catholic Church. Some had planned to be married last September and October. They cannot give over to the Liberals the defined doctrine of the Church, and neither can they marry outside the Church.

We of St. Benedict Center have, in these long months under siege, come to realize the meaning of Our Lord's words in St. Matthew, 19:29:

> "And every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake; shall receive an hundred fold, and shall possess life everlasting."

We, who see every day the men and women who have put off their marriages for His name's sake, can attest to the "hundred fold". They have received love a hundred fold in return. Their joy speaks much of God's love within them; they are beloved by us, their brothers and sisters in exile; and the love and admiration they bear for each other is a beautiful thing to see.

XXIX

IT WAS in July that the first of the "Reports to the Catholics of Boston" were sent out from St. Benedict Center. On July 11th, the initial batch of two thousand letters was mailed. Five hundred letters, written in the Italian language, were sent the next day to the Italians of Boston. So many people had written us that they had been unable to understand from the way the newspaper reports were handled what St. Benedict Center was trying to do, and on what it was basing its contentions, that Philip Gammans devised the "Reports to the Catholics of Boston" as the best means of getting out the information.

Philip Gammans managed, much to our delight, to issue not merely good reports, but pieces of clear and doctrinal writing. Lawrence Supple assisted him in the distribution, and the number of letters mailed finally became very large. We had no intention of flooding Boston with pamphlets. Our point was to get some report, with God's help and Our Lady's protection, into the right hands so that the Faith of the Catholics of Boston, wherever it was burning purely, would not be beclouded any further by evasive theological teaching.

We eventually came to have requests from all over the country for the "Reports". Every so often, of course, someone chose to understand us as saying that we were another St. Athanasius or St. Thomas More, whereas they knew us all along to be Luther or Calvin, but for the most part the reports were understood in the spirit in which they were written, and accomplished the purpose we had desired. There were six reports, all similar in form to the first, which read as follows:

REPORT TO THE CATHOLICS OF BOSTON

NO. 1

As long as a member of the Catholic hierarchy upholds the Faith and reflects the authority of the Pope, obedience to him is binding upon the conscience of every Catholic. But when a bishop denies one article of the Faith or undermines loyalty to the Pope by persecuting those who profess this loyalty, obedience to such a bishop becomes disobedience to God.

It is common knowledge that most of the great heresies were started by men who held high ecclesiastical position. For instance, Arius was a priest, Nestorius a patriarch, Eutyches an abbot, Luther a monk, and Jansenius a bishop. Those who placed obedience above doctrine and followed the commands of these men into heresy disobeyed God, cut themselves off from the Church, and forfeited their right to the kingdom of heaven.

What is now called the Greek Orthodox Church was once a part of the Holy Roman Church, but the people of the East continued to be obedient to their bishops even when those bishops had shown themselves to be heretical. Stubbornly and stupidly obedient, they followed their bishops into schism.

The ordinary Catholic cannot be left without guidance in a matter necessary for the salvation of his soul. And since at times an authentic pronouncement from the living Pope may be delayed for a long time by distance or war or other circumstances, Catholics can be guided in determining the substance of their Faith by the infallible pronouncements made by Popes in the past. Among these pronouncements none is clearer or more frequently reaffirmed than the dogma "There is no salvation outside the Church."

Saint Athanasius, the first Doctor of the Church, was exiled five times and excommunicated by *every* bishop in the East,

> but he never for a moment doubted that he was proclaiming the true faith and that the bishops who condemned him were in heresy and not to be obeyed. The Creed which bears his name, and which every priest reads in his Daily Office, states: "Whosoever wishes to be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith, which unless one preserves whole and inviolate, without doubt he will perish eternally."
>
> Those who deny this sacred doctrine often try to hide behind the vague wording of the Baltimore Catechism. But these people are immediately exposed by the unequivocal wording of the Irish Catechism, for instance, published in Dublin. Here is its treatment of the subject of salvation:
>
> Q. Is there any other true Church besides the Holy Catholic Church?
> A. No; as there is but one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, there is but one true Church.
> Q. Are all obliged to be of the true Church?
> A. Yes; no one can be saved out of it.
>
> This is the Catholic Faith. This is the Faith for which our fathers suffered. This is the Faith we must hold in order to be saved.

July passed and August came, and with it a continuance of the intensely humid hot weather which had made July in Cambridge so trying. The Center school was in full session. Each day we were looking for some answer to the many appeals which we had sent to Rome. We were hoping for the promise of a doctrinal hearing. On the morning of August 9th, an official letter at last arrived, for Father. As he read it, Father's expression became very grave. He decided to share the communication with us. There were actually two letters, both written in Latin. The first came from the General of the Jesuits in Rome, and was forwarded to Father Feeney through Loyola House, where another letter was included. I give below literal translations of both letters:

PROCESS of the Dismissal of Fr. Leonard Feeney, solemnly Professed of the Society of Jesus.

Since Rev. Father John J. McEleney is hindered by many occupations from acting as Judge Instructor in the process above mentioned, we have decreed to substitute in his place, by the present letter, Rev. Father Raymond Bidagor, a member of our Society, a Doctor in Canon Law.

Wherefore, by virtue of the present, we institute R.F. Raymond Bidagor S.J. as Judge Instructor in the aforesaid process, with all the power and the faculties which befit a Judge Instructor by right, according to the Canons, and we declare him so instituted. He will take for his assistant a Promoter of Justice and an Actuary, who will both take an oath before him, and he as Judge Instructor before an Actuary.

Given at Anagni, the 2nd day of August, 1949.

(signed) John B. Janssens, S.J.
General of the Society
of Jesus.

Place of Seal.

(signed) Anthony M. deAldama, S.J.
Actuary.

PROCESS OF THE DISMISSAL of F. Leonard Feeney, solemnly Professed of the Society of Jesus.

SUMMONS TO ONE DULY ACCUSED

Since in the Curia of the General of the Society of Jesus has been instigated the process of the dismissal from the Society of R. F. Leonard Feeney, solemnly professed, on account of the accusation made against him by the Promoter of Justice of the same Curia before a legitimate Tribunal, concerning the fault of permanent disobedience committed by that Father and which, from repeated admonitions, is said to have been virtually triple; and since We have been named by the Very Rev. F. John B. Janssens, General of the Society of Jesus and President of the Tribunal, by Decree of the 2nd day of August 1949 as Judge Instructor in the aforesaid process, We summon You, Father Leonard Feeney, by the present letter, in order that You may appear before Our Tribunal held in Our Room of this house (Loyola House, 297 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston), on the 13th day of August 1949, on the ninth hour before noon, to answer the questions which We have decided to put to You, and to confirm our doubt or to contest your fault.

Given in Boston, the 8th day of August, 1949.
(signed) Raymond Bidagor, S.J.
Judge Instructor.

(Seal of
the Soc. of
Jesus of N.E.)

(signed) John J. Crowley, S.J.
Actuary.

It was clear to us now in St. Benedict Center that all the interested powers-that-be were conspiring to make a legal case against Father Feeney so that he could be officially suppressed without allowing him to step out of censure or to raise his voice. It became increasingly clear to us that the General of the Jesuits in Rome, for reasons of his own, had to protect Father McEleney even in this, the greatest blunder that had been made in the history of the New England Province. Everyone has admitted this to be so. But the organization must go on, and they must, as the slang expression so vividly expresses it, "play ball" with one another if the kind of ecclesiasticism which is now rampant in America is to prevail.

Everyone wanted to pass the decision to execute Father Feeney on to someone else because, frankly, all were afraid of him. His very artlessness, and the fact that he had never once been connected in any way with ecclesiastical politics and had no friends at court to intercede for him, terrified his suppressors precisely because they never before had experienced such a situation. They were always wondering what Father Feeney might have up his sleeve. Every one of us at St. Benedict Center who knew and loved him, knew there was nothing up Father's sleeve except a childlike confidence that the Blessed Mother of God would support a priest who had courage enough to support her. Had the ecclesiastical committees known this, Father Feeney would have been suppressed long before. His conscience challenges could be ignored, but they were always afraid that there might be some legal angle to his case which might be an obstruction. And so a lawyer was called in against Father.

The lawyer they secured was a Father Bidagor, a noted Jesuit canonist from the Gregorian University in Rome. On the score of his being able to speak no English—and if he wished to talk with Father he could do so only in Latin—Father Bidagor could be presumed to be just the person for keeping the case in legal territory. And he knew only what canonists instructed by Bishop Wright and Father McEleney were giving him to make a brief of. He was lodged at Loyola House, on Commonwealth Avenue.

Father Feeney had, in the quiet of that hot August afternoon, a burst of inspiration. He went to the telephone and put in a call. It took some time for it to come through, but it finally was achieved. Father asked a question. "What is the nationality of Father Bidagor?" The reply came, "He is a Spaniard." Father Feeney asked, "Does he speak any English?" And the answer came back, "No. No English." In fifteen minutes, Father Feeney had a Spaniard on the way to interview Father Bidagor.

Juan Ribera-Faig had never visited Loyola House before, but the name "Loyola" was familiar to him from the floods of Spanish tradition in his high culture. He presented himself to the porter at Loyola House as a Spanish boy, speaking very rapid and scarcely intelligible English, who wanted to talk to Father Bidagor. The porter went off to take the message, leaving Juan time to reflect. Father Feeney's devotion to St. Ignatius was well-known in the Jesuit Order, as was the fact that he had a warm spot in his heart for Spain. The idea of having a Spanish Jesuit try him made it look very Ignatian, and might touch poetic loyalties in Father Feeney's filial heart.

An Italian priest was sent down, after some moments, to meet Mr. Ribera. Who this Italian priest was, we have never been able to discover. He spoke such poor English that he was obliged, finally, to break into what seemed to Juan to be a combination of Spanish and Italian. Whether from some spark of courage the priest saw in Juan's eyes, or from what seemed stupidity in his manner (caused by Juan's frantic efforts to follow the conversation in three languages), Juan Ribera at length placated the timorous Italian priest, who apparently must have made up his mind that Juan was just a poor Spanish student in Boston longing to talk to a priest from his native country. And so, after another wait, Father Bidagor was permitted to come to the parlour to speak with Mr. Ribera.

The conversation lasted for an hour and a half. Juan told Father Bidagor his own story, discussed Boston for a minute or two, and then openly informed him that the object of his visit was to discuss with him the case of Father Feeney, "about which you have doubtless heard something already". Juan then described Father, the Center, Father's work, his transfer, the conditions leading up to it and subsequent upon it. He reviewed the "Boston heresy case", Father's silencing, the interdicting of the Center. Juan did it very thoroughly. Every so often, Father Bidagor would make a remark, or ask a question.

"What I want to tell you, Father," Juan said at last, "is that since the time of the silencing of Father Feeney everybody in authority in Boston has been trying to distort the whole issue by making it appear that Father Feeney's case is a disciplinary one, and not a dogmatic or doctrinal one, which in reality it is. They have put all emphasis on the question of obedience without wishing to consider whether in this case obedience was legitimate."

"But," said Father Bidagor, "obedience is supreme."

"No, it isn't!" Juan said, "but rather must it be subordinated to the law of God and to the preservation of the Truth." Here Father Bidagor gave the appearance of being shocked. He laughed and asked how Juan could say such a thing. He remarked that obedience and the law of God were the same thing, and could not be opposed to each other. Juan answered that this was not so; as a matter of fact they could very easily be opposed to each other.

"For instance, Father," he said, "let us assume that a superior commands something which is against one of the dogmas of the Faith; say, 'Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus'? In such a case, it is perfectly clear that such a superior should not be obeyed."

Father Bidagor leaned forward in his seat. His assumed polite interest was gone. He talked quickly, intensely for several moments. Finally, he said that the expression "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus" (outside the Church there is no salvation) *was not a dogma, but only a formula,* and the way Mr. Ribera presented it was not correct.

"I'm sorry, Father," Juan answered, "but that doctrine is a dogma of the Faith which has been defined several times. It is referred to in many *ex cathedra* statements, as well as in the writings of the Doctors, as is clearly indicated in the HOUSETOPS, which I just gave you." Father Bidagor then agreed, by saying, "All right! All right!" but he added, "A dogma is a very complicated thing, and when it is defined it is defined in 'its proper terms'. We have to be very careful in applying it."

"What is the point, Father," Juan asked, exasperated, "of defining a dogma, *if defining only makes it more obscure?"*

Father Bidagor did not reply. He was absorbed in giving to Juan the classical liberal example brought out on every such occasion. We had once thought this example peculiar to Americans, but we have come to find that it is the stock in trade of liberals in every land. The example is: "What about the man who lives in the middle of the desert (or on a desert island) and has never heard about the Church? He believes in God and believes that God can reward him. He lives a perfect life, never commits a mortal sin, and makes perfect acts of love of God."

That one such man could occur would be truly extraordinary. To remain in the state of grace is an achievement for Catholics, who all their lives have had the inestimable aid of the sacraments. Even after a lifetime of faithful reception of the sacraments, very few Catholics would feel confident that they could make one *perfect* act of love of God. They hope they could, they strive every day to love God. But an act of perfect love of God is something which only the Christian saints could be said, with certainty, to have made. This whole question was fought out once before by the Church, during the Pelagian heresy.

Juan answered Father Bidagor, "If this man were to be as good as you say, God would certainly find a means of getting him acquainted with the Church."

"No," Father Bidagor replied, "we cannot pretend to tell God what to do in the matter of salvation."

"But, Father," Juan told him, "*God* did tell *us* very clearly what to do in order to be saved!"

Father Bidagor disregarded this remark and went on to explain that the man in the desert, inasmuch as he had made a perfect act of love of God, could also be said to have "baptism of desire". Juan remonstrated that neither St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J., nor St. Peter Canisius, also a Jesuit, nor any other of the Doctors of the Church, explains "baptism of desire" in this liberal sense. He referred Father Bidagor again to the HOUSETOPS for the writings of the Doctors on "baptism of desire", and he reminded him that the dogma "Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus" was clearly contained in the Deposit of Faith.

"Father," he said to him, finally, "the American Liberals don't stop even with the 'man in the desert'. They go so far as to pretend that the 'invincibly ignorant' person is the fellow living next door."

At this point the question had become a real argument, so that Juan had difficulty remembering the exact order of questions and answers. Father Bidagor was leaning forward, almost out of his seat, talking excitedly, and looking at Juan very intensely through his glasses. He at last cut the discussion short by saying that he certainly knew his theology, which he had studied very well, and Juan was not the one to explain it to him. Juan replied that this he was willing to believe, but he was certain that the theology Father Bidagor had had was the kind of theology which the Liberals had been teaching for the last one hundred and fifty years. However, he added, it was our duty to realize the error and correct it.

Father Bidagor, with a depreciative gesture, sat back in his chair. "This question of Liberalism is quite a dead story," he said, apparently mistaking the sense in which the word was being used, "and this question of salvation has nothing to do with it." He went on to say that his ideas were what the Church teaches on salvation, whereupon Juan repeated his reference to the Popes, Councils and Doctors, who certainly did not teach Father Bidagor's doctrine.

"All right, Father", Juan said. "What I want to ask you is not to forget that the whole issue in Father Feeney's case is of a doctrinal nature, and not a disciplinary one, as the authorities in Boston want to pretend. I want to warn you so that you may not be unduly influenced by them."

"I don't see why they should try to influence me", Father Bidagor answered.

"Of course they will try to influence you if you have to judge Father Feeney."

"I, judge Father Feeney? What do you mean?" Father Bidagor asked, with affected astonishment. "I don't have anything to do with the case."

"But, Father, let us assume that you *had* something to do with it."

"Why should I get mixed up with that? What do you mean? I must repeat that I don't have anything to do with it."

"All right, Father; I want only to warn you of the purely doctrinal character of this issue so that should they take advantage of your stay in Boston and consult you, you would know the truth on the matter."

"But, *no,* I don't see why they should consult me, seeing that I am in Boston only for a visit."

"Father, they might very easily involve you in this issue seeing that you are a famous canonist of the Gregorian University, in Rome."

"Oh! that's nonsense! How did you know that, anyway?"

"Father, we know very well that you came right from Rome just to judge Father Feeney."

"How can you know a thing like that? Did you also know that I was a Spaniard? How do you know that?"

"Oh, Our Lady takes good care of us."

"I don't understand you. What do you mean?"

"Father," Juan said, emphasizing every word, "we know that you have summoned Father Feeney for a disciplinary trial to be held next Saturday at nine o'clock."

"But *how* could you know that? I don't know what you are talking about."

"Father, I myself have seen the letter signed by you which you sent to Father Feeney, summoning him."

"Have you really? Do you mean that you have read the letter?"

"Yes, Father, I have."

"Did Father Feeney show it to you?"

"Yes. All the people at the Center are very close, and Father Feeney is not afraid of telling us everything. We have to protect Father."

"Well! That changes the whole thing!" Father Bidagor straightened again in his chair, from which he had started at the beginning of the new development. "Why didn't you tell me this before?" he said. "I could not understand you. I did not know what you were talking about. Please excuse me. I am very sorry. I did not understand you. I must apologize. I think you can easily understand my position. *Please* excuse me, will you?"

"Yes, Father. Of course, I understand your position."

"Do you know if Father Feeney is going to come?"

"No, I don't know. He's considering it, with much concern; because it is clear that he is to be judged on a disciplinary basis and not on a doctrinal one, as it should be."

"Well, well," said Father Bidagor, interrupting, "so you were telling me that you have been here for two years?"

"Yes, Father. But please remember that Father Feeney's case is a dogmatic one, and not a case of discipline."

"If you will forgive me," Father Bidagor answered, "I have something to do." He made a gesture for Juan to rise.

"Very well, Father", Juan replied. "I only wanted to protect you against possible misinformation."

Father Bidagor arose and handed Juan the copy of the HOUSETOPS. Juan assured him that the copy of the magazine was for him to keep. He then enclosed in the HOUSETOPS copies of three of the Center reports to the Catholics of Boston, and handed the magazine back to Father Bidagor. They walked toward the door. Father Bidagor thanked Juan for coming, and Juan invited Father Bidagor to the Center, to see the boys studying or to hear the lectures. Father Bidagor replied that it would not be possible for him to come at present, since he was very busy. They said good-bye at the door. It was after five o'clock. Juan had arrived at Loyola House shortly after three o'clock. Two of the Center men had been waiting, and they drove Juan back to the Center.

"My dear Juan," said Father Feeney, "I can never thank you enough! You have told me all I want to know. Father

Bidagor is a priest to whom doctrine has no importance, and to whom legal process is the absolute rule of a priest's conscience."

Father went to his office, and dictated in French the following cable to the General of the Jesuit Order:

(*Translation*)

August 9, 1949.

Most Reverend John-Baptist Jansens, S.J.,
Gisa, Rome.

Having discovered, after a discussion of an hour and a half between Father Raymond Bidagor, S.J., and my representative, that Father Bidagor considers it possible to be saved outside the Catholic Church, I refuse to accept him as arbiter of my doctrinal dispute with Father Provincial of the Society of Jesus in New England. I appeal in conscience to Your Paternity, and I am prepared to follow up my appeal to the Holy See. Letter follows.

Father Leonard Feeney, S.J.,
23 Arrow Street,
Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

Father then dictated the following letter to Father Bidagor:

(*Translation from the Latin*)

August 9, 1949.

Rev. Raymond Bidagor, S.J.,
Judge Instructor,
Loyola House,
297 Commonwealth Ave.,
Boston, Massachusetts.

Reverend Father in Christ, P.C.,

I have received today your letter summoning me to appear before your canonical tribunal on Saturday. Having prayed, I immediately sent to you my delegate, Juan Ribera-Faig so that, from the fact that he speaks Spanish, he might investigate with greatest certainty the nature of the thing

> of which I am accused and of the process on account of which I am summoned.
>
> Mr. Ribera-Faig affirms, after a conversation with you of an hour and a half, that you first denied that "outside the Church there is no salvation" is a defined dogma, and that after he indicated to you the Council which defined it dogmatically, you admitted that it was; but denied that its application should be made to all those outside the Church. Likewise concerning the necessity of submission to the Roman Pontiff in order to attain salvation. Having understood these things, and because I have already suffered persecution for one year now on account of a dogmatic cause and not a canonical one (I deny that I am disobedient), in conscience I am obliged to refuse to appear before your tribunal or to confide my case to the judgment of one of your heretical persuasion.
>
> I have already sent a telegram to Rev. Father General concerning this matter.
>
> I am Your Reverence's servant in Christ,
>
> (signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

The next morning, Father wrote a long letter, in French, to the General of the Society of Jesus. The following is a translation of the letter from the French:

> (*Literal Translation*)
>
> August 10, 1949.
>
> Very Rev. John-Baptist Janssens, S.J.,
> General of the Society of Jesus,
> Borgo Santo Spirito 5,
> Rome, Italy.
>
> Reverend Father in Jesus Christ, Pax Christi:
>
> I am writing this letter to you in a moment of great distress, appealing to Your Paternity against the injustice with which I have been treated since last September. Having presented several appeals accusing Father John J. McEleney, S.J., of heresy, and never having received an answer or the slightest consideration from Your Paternity, I find it impossible to

understand your insistence on ignoring my very serious accusations and on neglecting my appeals. The more I express my distress and suffering to see the Catholic Faith disappear from among the Catholics of the United States, because of the heretical teachings of my brothers of the Society of Jesus, the more do my enemies, who are betraying their Faith and their sacred vows of fidelity to the Catholic doctrine and to His Holiness, the Pope, find themselves supported in their tyrannical measures by the decrees and the disciplinary measures directed against me and proceeding from Your Paternity. I am appealing for the last time to Your paternal and priestly office, and if you refuse once more to listen to my just and legitimate appeal, I will be forced to appeal to His Holiness, the Pope, and to His Holy Office. I am in possession of all the documents necessary to establish the justness of my accusations.

The grievances which force me to write this letter to you are the following:

(1) Neither I nor any of my disciples and spiritual children have ever yet received from Your Paternity one single answer to our several just and honest appeals.

(2) The more I appeal to your primordial duty as a Christian and most especially as General of the Society of Jesus, namely to your sacred duty to protect with the greatest care the Catholic Faith in its integrity and to fight ceaselessly against every heresy and every fatal doctrinal innovation (for this is the principal aim of our Society), the more I find myself assailed with new disciplinary measures accusing me of disobedience, entirely ignoring my accusations and my appeals, always with a marked prejudice on the part of Your Paternity favoring the local superiors who are persecuting me, and with a silence even more marked in regard to their liberal and heretical doctrines. I am scandalized to see the lack of consideration shown by your office towards the dogmas of the Church.

(3) None of your delegates has ever investigated the matter from my side. Fr. Vincent McCormick, S.J., in the course of his long visit of investigation in the United States, has written me only three very brief letters and has given me only a short

interview of one hour at Boston College, and even during these very rare contacts with me, he has always categorically refused to discuss my grievances of a doctrinal nature; and yet I cannot stop repeating that it is totally impossible to understand and judge the dispute between my Provincial and myself if the prime factor, the doctrine of the necessity of the Church and of submission to the Roman Pontiff for salvation, is constantly neglected and voluntarily ignored. Now that Fr. McCormick is on his way back to Europe, your second delegate, Fr. Raymond Bidagor, S.J., is adopting exactly the same attitude. Not only does he refuse to consider my legitimate doctrinal accusations, but he has clearly shown his liberalism in an interview of an hour and a half with my delegate. He too shares the heresy of Fathers McEleney, Keleher and Donnelly, S.J.

(4) The tribunal which you have sent to judge me is entirely prejudiced for the following reasons:

(a) Fr. Bidagor, S.J., who has been commissioned by you to judge my case has been named "Judex Instructor" in place of Fr. McEleney, S.J., since the latter cannot take charge of it, being "hindered by many occupations." This means that Your Paternity persists in wanting to consider my Provincial as a competent judge in a case in which he finds himself accused of heresy on the one hand and of unjust and tyrannical government on the other. A delegate who is coming to judge me in place of my Provincial cannot be impartial in the present circumstances.

(b) Fr. Bidagor, S.J., is coming with the deliberate purpose of considering nothing but the question of disobedience, without being even willing to discuss the doctrinal controversy, which is the basis of the whole dispute between my superiors and myself. Furthermore, even if Fr. Bidagor were desirous of judging the doctrinal dispute or if he had been delegated to this end, he would not necessarily be competent therein, since he is not a theologian but a Doctor in Canon Law, and especially because he professes the same heretical doctrine as Fr. McEleney, S.J.

(c) Even concerning the purely disciplinary accusations which Fr. Bidagor intends to take up as the only subject for consideration in his tribunal, I am grieved to discover, from the letter that I received from him and which is dated August 8, that he is not coming as an impartial judge in order to try and determine who is guilty, Fr. McEleney of tyrannical and unjust government, or myself, of illegitimate disobedience. On the contrary, it is very clear that Fr. Bidagor is coming with the express aim of officially pronouncing me guilty of "permanent disobedience," as can be clearly seen in the abovementioned letter.

(5) As a professed Father in the Society of Jesus, I have the right to refuse to appear before a prejudiced court which has already made up its mind in favor of my enemies in the controversy; to appear before a court whose only aim is to legalize and to render canonical my dismissal from the Society of Jesus, having clearly judged in advance that this dismissal is honest and just, and having never given me the opportunity to defend myself and to prove freely my accusations.

(6) I have also the right, as a professed Father in the Society of Jesus, to refuse to appear before a court in which the judge is sitting in place of my adversary in the controversy and is clearly embracing his cause, before a court in which the judge will be assisted by some other adversaries of mine in the doctrinal controversy, and in which I will be the only accused party to appear in order to testify against my own innocence, while a truly impartial court would summon both adversaries to appear and defend their case, namely Fr. McEleney to defend himself against the accusations of heresy made by me, both against him and against the Society of Jesus under his authority here in New England, and myself in turn to defend myself against the accusations of disobedience presented by Fr. McEleney.

(7) I am perfectly willing to appear before an impartial court in order to defend myself against the false accusations of my adversaries, if my judges do not persistently try to ignore the doctrinal controversy, for it is the basis of my so-called "disobedience" and the cause of everything that has taken

place since last September, as the whole world knows by now, and secondly, if Your Paternity decides to listen to me and to institute another tribunal to judge my adversaries in the Society of Jesus, according to my accusations of heresy.

(8) Your Paternity very well knows that the reason for which I refused, last September, to conform myself to the orders of my Provincial is that the latter, in connivance with the archdiocesan authorities of Boston, disapproved of my orthodox doctrines and wished to destroy them at all cost. I could not in conscience help, by my absolute submission, such a project against the Faith. I have communicated to my Provincial that it was impossible for me, in conscience, to conform myself to his decrees, but he has invariably refused to listen to me, or to be willing to learn what could constitute such an obstacle in my conscience, or even to admit that it could be possible for a subject ever to have any reason not to be able, in conscience, to conform himself to the decrees of a superior. I have received the same treatment from Fr. McCormick.

I have also received the same treatment from Your Paternity. I have already communicated to you my conscience difficulties as a priest and as a Jesuit whose first duty is to preserve intact the Catholic Faith against every innovation and every heresy. I have never received an answer to my letters, and, what is more, all your delegates have come to treat with me as judges who have already judged my case in advance, and not as paternal superiors who are trying to understand what could thus keep me from obeying an order, or what conscience difficulty was legitimately keeping me at St. Benedict Center. Since the beginning of this case, I have been constantly treated by all my superiors in such a way as would make it seem as if a Jesuit could never have a legitimate reason, in conscience, not to obey an unjust and arbitrary order of a superior, or as if the vow of obedience meant a total renunciation of one's conscience and free will in such a way that a Jesuit would be bound to obey his superior even in case such obedience would constitute a sin for him.

In the hope that this appeal, as well as all the points enumerated, will receive a just and paternal consideration from Your Paternity, and in the hope of receiving from Your Paternity an encouraging communication in my fight and my crusade to preserve and defend the Catholic Faith, I remain

Very Reverend Father in Jesus Christ,
Your loving and devoted son in the
Immaculate Heart of Mary,
(signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

Father Feeney had a series of letters from Father Bidagor, vainly trying to keep up communication with him, but inasmuch as Father had stated his full case in the letter to the General of the Jesuits, he was willing to let the matter rest on that point, except for polite acknowledgments of Father Bidagor's correspondence.

His Paternity, the General of the Jesuits, did not answer Father's letter.

XXX

IT WAS a fact long deplored by St. Benedict Center that Archbishop Cushing had had no direct communication with the Center since the Sunday in May 1948, when the procession in honor of the Infant Jesus of Prague took place on his grounds. The four professors had sought him out in their vain attempt to get from him a doctrinal pronouncement. The Center students had likewise vainly sought him for a pronouncement on their marriage. But the Archbishop, on his own, had never paternally written or come to see—or even asked to see—Father or any of the members of St. Benedict Center.

When, therefore, on the last evening in August, the Center telephone rang and the person on the other end said he was Archbishop Cushing wishing to speak with Father Feeney, no one believed it. Father thought it was one of his friends trying to be funny. However, it *was* the Archbishop. He asked Father if he would like to come to the archiepiscopal residence the next day, at three o'clock, to hear a letter from the Holy Father, the Pope.

"It is a letter for me, Your Excellency?" Father asked.

"It is a letter concerning you", the Archbishop replied.

"In what connection does it concern me?" Father again asked.

"If you would like to come up tomorrow afternoon, I will read it to you", His Excellency answered.

"Why do you put it in such polite invitation, Your Excellency?" Father wanted to know. "If it is a letter intended for me to read, why don't you give it to me? Or else why don't you give me an order to come and listen to it?"

"I thought you might like to come up and hear some parts of it which I am willing to read to you."

"Isn't this a rather odd way to convey a message from the Supreme Pontiff to one of his subjects? Frankly, Your Excellency, you can very clearly see that I am not talking to you in filial fashion, and that is because you have for well over a year been to me so unpaternal. Frankly also, Your Excellency, I suspect because of the brutal way you have handled me for the last year, including the smearing of my name before the whole country by way of the public newspapers, that this is some further device for humiliating me and harassing the young people with whom I am working. I am trying so hard to protect them. You very well know how often they have pleaded for *your* protection. If you have something that concerns us by way of additional punishment or rebuke, why don't you come over to the Center like a kindly father to his children and see us all here, as we study and we pray, and let us know what we are doing which is contrary to the laws and teachings of our Holy Mother, the Church?"

The Archbishop said he had no intention of coming, and that ended the telephone conversation.

The next afternoon at three-thirty, Monsignor Furlong, dressed in a red robe, and the Assistant Chancellor, Father Sennott, in a long black cape, and Monsignor Hickey, the Vicar General of the archdiocese, in street clothes, entered St. Benedict Center. In the presence of all the students, Monsignor Furlong asked to see Father Feeney. Father Feeney presented himself, and Monsignor Furlong then took out some kind of scroll, held it formally in front of him, and asked

Father Feeney if he would like to hear part of its contents. Father Feeney said if the document was for him, he would be glad to receive it, or if there was something in it which directly concerned himself or St. Benedict Center, let Monsignor Furlong say what it was. But as for expressing a desire as to whether or not he would like to hear passages in it read, Father was inclined to feel that he would not. As Father later explained to the Center, it was like a sheriff pretending he had a warrant for your arrest, coming into your house and asking if you would like to hear a few choice passages from a document directed against you as a culprit. You could hardly be blamed for not leaping with joy at this idea, or imploring excitedly, "Oh, do go on!"

Monsignor Furlong turned with his retinue and walked out of the Center. An hour later, *The Pilot* came out with what it called an "Official Letter" from the Holy Office, condemning the actions and the teachings of St. Benedict Center. So that our readers may be able to judge for themselves what kind of a document this is by way of "an official decree", and so that our readers may be able to inspect what a strange mixture of official pronouncement and local comment this purported decree was, we are publishing it here in full, exactly as it appeared on the front page of *The Pilot,* Volume 120, No. 36, for September 3, 1949. The idea of reading parts of it to Father Feeney was clearly part of the scheme to protect the Chancery against the charge of not having let the culprits know what was going to happen to them. They were given an hour's notice. At the silencing of Father Feeney, no notice whatsoever was given, and so the Chancery had improved the charity of its technique in the interval of the five months that passed between Father Feeney's silencing and his condemnation by what Archbishop Cushing had originally referred to over the telephone as an official document from "Our Holy Father, the Pope".

The Pilot

Official organ of the Archdiocese of Boston, Mass.
Established 1829

SEPTEMBER 3, 1949

VOLUME 120. NO. 36.

Holy Office Condemns Teachings and Actions Of St. Benedict's Center

An official letter has been received by Archbishop Cushing from the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, through the Apostolic Delegate in Washington, the Most Rev. Amleto G. Cicognani, answering what are called "the opinions and contentions" of the followers of Saint Benedict's Center in Cambridge. Included in this group are four young professors who accused the faculty of Boston College of teaching heresy, and two students of Emmanuel College who resigned from that institution on the eve of Commencement last Spring. The letter from Rome bears the signature of His Eminence Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani.

The Holy Office, over which the Pope himself presides, is the Congregation which safeguards the teaching of faith and morals. The Roman pronouncement reveals that this Sacred Congregation met in plenary session on Wednesday, July 27, 1949, and that the decisions set forth in this letter were approved by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in an audience on the following day.

The Holy Office declares: "This Sacred Congregation is convinced that the unfortunate dispute is due to an insufficient study and understanding of the well known dictum 'Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus,' and that the dispute has been rendered more acrimonious because of the serious disturbance of discipline occasioned by the refusal of some members of the aforementioned group to revere and obey duly constituted authority." The Sacred Congregation refers to the axiom as "an incontestable principle," but continues: "However, this doctrine must be understood in the sense in which the Church herself understands it. Surely it is not to private judgment that Our Savior committed for exposition the deposit of faith, but to the teaching office of the Church."

The Roman letter points out that the teachings of Saint Benedict's Center are inconsistent with pronouncements of His Holiness Pope Pius XII concerning the relationship to the Church of those who are not of the Fold. The Holy Office condemns the teaching of the Cambridge group in these terms: *"From all the foregoing it is clear that the doctrine presented by the periodical FROM THE HOUSETOPS (Vol. 3) as genuine Catholic teaching, is far from being such, and can do nothing but grave harm both to those who are in the Church and to those outside it."*

With regard to recent actions of the Center leaders, the Holy Office employed severe terms of censure, declaring it "beyond understanding how St. Benedict's Center can consistently claim to be a Catholic school, and desire to be called such, while actually refusing to conform to the prescriptions of Canon Law, and while functioning as a source of discord and revolt against Church authority, and as a cause of great upset to many consciences."

The letter singled out by name the sole priest associated with the Center and declared: "Similarly it is beyond understanding how a member of a religious society, namely Father Feeney, can present himself as a 'defender of the faith,' and at the same time not hesitate to attack the catechetical teaching proposed by legitimate authorities, and not even fear to bring upon himself the weighty sanctions of Canon Law leveled against his grave violations of duty as a religious, as a priest, and as an ordinary member of the Church."

> The Sacred Congregation reproved the publishing activities of Saint Benedict's Center, saying: ". . . it is nowise to be borne that Catholics should arrogate to themselves the right to publish a magazine for spreading theological doctrines, without that permission of competent Church authority which is called an 'imprimatur', and which is exacted by Canon Law."
>
> Center spokesmen have repeatedly declared that they would be content only with a pronouncement from the Holy See itself. The letter from the Holy Office points out that now "Rome has spoken," and ends with a solemn warning to the dissident group "at the peril of their souls" immediately to return to Church unity in belief and practice.
>
> Acting on instructions which accompanied the letter, the Archbishop telephoned Father Feeney on Wednesday night, Aug. 31, and invited him to come to the Archbishop's house on Thursday afternoon to hear the decision of the Holy Office. Father Feeney did not come, nor did any of the group identified with him.
>
> In a further effort to reconcile these misled persons, the Archbishop sent the Vicar General and two representatives of Chancery to communicate the contents of the letter to Father Feeney and his adherents at their own address. They were unwilling to listen to the letter, thus refusing submission to the Pope and the Church. The Archbishop asks prayers in their behalf.

This statement pretends to be a decree (it was reported as "a decree" in the Catholic press all over the country), and it is simply a letter. It purports to be an *official* letter, and yet only parts of it are quoted. We do not say that someone in the Holy Office is not willing to support these sentences, provided they be doctrinally vague, but it is clear that what Archbishop Cushing, Bishop Wright, and Monsignor Furlong were attempting to give the impression was an official decree, was not such. It is patent to anyone who reads the announcement in *The Pilot* that there is no official character to it of the kind required for a decree. Professors of theology in seminaries outside this diocese have openly admitted this to their students.

Another astounding fact attendant upon the publication of this so-called decree is this: immediately upon its publication, a notice was sent from Archbishop Cushing to the various rectories and religious houses in the archdiocese requiring that the priests make no mention of the matter in their sermons or even in their conversations to others. The reason given was that the case was now closed. The notice even went so far as to quote the saying: "Roma locuta est; causa finita est." * However, as everybody knows, this saying, "Roma locuta est; causa finita est", has always been used to indicate that those in whose favor Rome has spoken are now free to teach and talk, and that the opponents must stop talking and teaching. It is a strange kind of a "decree" which will keep the priests whom it is supporting from uttering the truth in which they have been supported by Rome, and from letting the faithful know the errors which are being taught by their adversaries.

The Pilot release had rather the appearance of a technical protection of ecclesiastical prestige. It did not give the confused people of Boston an answer to the doctrine, and it gave added encouragement to the Liberals, who immediately outstripped themselves in wide and erroneous statements in the newspapers, as we shall show.

The newspapers had telephoned us that *The Pilot* statement was coming out. One newspaper reporter brought us what he said was one of the first two *Pilots* off the press. When we saw the statement we were for awhile at an utter loss to know what to make of it. The reporter, whose treatment of us all through the case had been consistently fair, human and untouched by pressure, was waiting for a statement from us.

---

* "Rome has spoken; the case is finished."

We read the release through several times, and typed out the following for him:

> It is reported by *The Pilot* in the letter from the Holy Office, which it partially quotes and partially composes, that "the decisions set forth in this letter were approved by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, *in an audience*." (Italics ours.) St. Benedict Center still knows that it has had no answer on its doctrinal crusade and its appeal for an *ex cathedra pronouncement* from the Holy Father. IS THERE SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, or IS THERE NOT? If we have said something inconsistent with Catholic doctrine, we would like to know what it is from the Holy See and in clear, definite statement.
>
> The one unmistakable statement from the Holy Office that got through the censorship of *The Pilot* is the reaffirmation of the fact that the doctrine that there is no salvation outside the Church "is an incontestable principle." This is exactly the principle which Archbishop Cushing, Bishop Wright and Boston College have contested, and the principle for which we have been suffering for a solid year. *The Pilot* advises us to "return to the unity of the Church at the peril of our souls." That we are outside the unity of the Church we deny.

The next day many of the newspapers pilloried us in the headlines and in the news. The *Boston Daily Record* ran two-inch headlines which screamed from every news stand: POPE ASSAILS FEENEY GROUP—Censures St. Benedict's Center As Source of Discord and Revolt. The *Boston Daily Globe* wrote:

> Vatican Condemns
> Cambridge Center
>
> The Vatican has condemned the teachings of the St. Benedict Center, Cambridge, and has warned Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., four discharged Boston College professors and their followers at the Center that they remain outside the authority of the Catholic Church "at the peril of their souls," it was revealed last night.

> Announcement that Rome had acted in the matter of the doctrinal dispute was made by Archbishop Cushing, who disclosed that the Vatican ruling was contained in an official letter from the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. . . .

The story went on for columns.

The next serious consequence, from the standpoint of doctrine, was headlined in the *Worcester Telegram,* for Friday morning, September 2, 1949. We sent this first page of the *Worcester Telegram* to the Holy Office. The headlines ran:

VATICAN RULES
AGAINST HUB
DISSIDENTS

Holds No Salvation
Outside Church
Doctrine *to Be False* (the italics are ours)

There it was, plain as day. The Vatican holds No Salvation Outside the Church to be a *false* doctrine. No one could deny that this was one wolf the shepherds had let into the sheepfold. That the *Worcester Telegram* should draw this conclusion is not surprising. It would have been surprising if someone had not drawn it.

The *News-Tribune* of Waltham, Mass., headlined: *Vatican Statement Supports Archdiocesan Stand,* and then went on, with the aid of Monsignor Furlong, to make some astounding statements:

Vatican
Hits Heresy
At Center
As Harmful

Dissidents Still
Seek Papal Word

> A ruling by the Boston Archdiocese that St. Benedict's Center in Cambridge is off-bounds to Catholics as a result of

> teaching the heresy that there is not salvation outside the Catholic Church has been vindicated by a letter from the Vatican censuring the group severely.
>
> The chancellor of the Archdiocese, Msgr. Walter J. Furlong, told the News-Tribune this morning that Rev. Leonard Feeney, S.J., director of the center, was asking for the rarest of pronouncements when he refused to respect the letter from the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office and demanded an "ex cathedra" statement.
>
> This type of statement, in which the Pope speaks directly on matters of faith and morals, would result only in case of a seriously disputed point of doctrine needing clarification, according to Msgr. Furlong. He added that doctrine on the point of salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church is clear. . . .
>
> The latest edition of the Baltimore Catechism, official body of Catholic Doctrine in this country, published earlier this year, stated positively there may be salvation outside the church under certain conditions where persons of good will are acting according to the dictates of their conscience. *The doctrine is not new but stems from the post-reformation period. . . .* (italics are ours)

The newspapers and radio broadcasts of Friday, September 2nd, repeated over and over the warning to St. Benedict Center to "return to the Church [as they put it] at the peril of their souls". Father answered as many times, "That we are outside the Church (as you say), we deny." On Saturday, to add to the list of inconsistencies, we found the newspaper headlines declaring that we might not yet be outside the Church, after all! *The Boston Traveler,* Saturday, September 3, 1949, said:

> Church May
> Oust Priest,
> Four Others
>
> Vatican City, Sept. 3 (UP)—An unimpeachable Vatican source said today that a Jesuit priest and four discharged Boston

> Catholic college professors may be excommunicated if they persist in their "obstinate ways." . . .
>
> The source implied that Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston would decide on the matter. . . .
>
> "After they have been deprived of the sacraments, they may even be excommunicated. It is absolutely out of the question that the Pontiff will say anything after the action of Archbishop Cushing and the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. Now it is only a matter of procedure according to canon law. There is no further need for Vatican action because their archbishop has full jurisdiction, authority and guidance."

The New York Times for Sunday, September 4, 1949, printed Father's answer to this latest new release:

> Feeney Will Appeal
> To Vatican If Banned
>
> Boston, Sept. 3—Commenting on a report that he faces possible excommunication, the Rev. Leonard Feeney said today that he would appeal any such action to the Pope in person.
>
> An unofficial Vatican source has been quoted as saying that Father Feeney and four of his adherents may be excommunicated if they persist in their "obstinate" ways.
>
> Father Feeney, head of St. Benedict's Center in Cambridge, has not receded from his contention that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. . . .
>
> His appeal to the Vatican would have "the backing of thousands of Greater Boston Catholics who are ready to support me in an emergency," Father Feeney said. He added that he was sure that the Pope would want to hear "the true story" of the controversy, "which has never been presented to him by Auxiliary Bishop John J. Wright and his political friends in Rome."
>
> The noted Jesuit author and lecturer insisted that, even though excommunicated, "I will never withdraw my allegiance to the holy Catholic faith or to the Holy Father." . . .

On September 17th, 1949, Father Feeney sent the following letter to His Eminence, Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani, Secretary of the Holy Office and Vicar General of Rome:

(*Translation from the Latin*)

> It is now being proclaimed everywhere in American newspapers, both secular and Catholic, that the Holy Office edited an official decree, signed by you, and approved by the Roman Pontiff, and partially quoted by the official newspaper of the diocese of Boston, "The Pilot", in which decree it is announced that the dogma of the Church "Outside the Church there is no salvation" we must now interpret according to the norms of American liberalism according to which salvation is bestowed on everyone on account of his own sincerity.
>
> The servant and son in Christ of Your Eminence,
>
> (signed) Leonard Feeney, S.J.

The Catholic press throughout the United States announced *The Pilot* release of the letter from the Holy Office as a "*decree* from the Holy Office", and printed columns of commentary upon it. Their condemnation of Father Feeney and St. Benedict Center was complete. A great many of the facts in their stories of Father and the Center were so unfounded that we thought, for a while, of writing to the National Catholic Welfare Council, from whose news service much of the copy had been obtained by the Catholic papers. The N. C. W. C. had never telephoned us for a verification of any of the facts about us which had gone out over the country. We were so aghast at what had happened to the doctrine, however, that we did not get around to protesting the treatment of ourselves.

In the meantime, people had been thinking the matter over. So many letters came to the Center asking for our interpretation of *The Pilot* statement and saying that they could get from it no definite answer on the doctrine, that Philip Gammans wrote "Report to the Catholics of Boston—No. 6". Actually this report was sent to all parts of the United States, to Canada and to Europe, as well as to the Catholics of Boston. It read as follows:

> ### REPORT TO THE CATHOLICS OF BOSTON—No. 6
>
> On September 1st, the Pilot, the official paper of the archdiocese of Boston, published what it called a condemnation of St. Benedict Center by the Holy Office. What was called a "decree" of the Holy Office was in reality a letter from the secretary of the Holy Office to Archbishop Cushing. Although this letter was written on the 27th of July, it was more than a month later, just before Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing sailed for Ireland, that parts of it were published (after considerable recomposition) by the Pilot.
>
> This letter was not a decree; if it were, it would have been quoted in full, and it would have said DECREE across the top of it. Although a decree of the Holy Office is by no means infallible, still it is a shocking thing that Bishop Wright, with the cooperation of the secretary to the Holy Office, should allow the people to draw the conclusion that this letter was a decree. Saint Benedict Center still has not seen this letter; diocesan officials offered to read to us parts of what they said was a copy, but merely as a formality, for the Pilot was off the press an hour after the offer.
>
> The world may not realize for some time the horror of what has been done by Bishop Wright and Archbishop Cushing. With the weak and sinful cooperation of political friends in Rome, they have spread throughout the world the belief that the Church has repudiated one of its dogmas. They have done this at the very moment when the Vatican is exhorting the Polish and Czech peoples to resist Communism. Why should these people be asked to die to preserve the Faith for their children if these children can become "sincere" Communists or "sincere" anything else and still be saved?
>
> No other dogma of the Catholic Faith has been more often infallibly defined than that for which we at the Center are fighting. The dogma is that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. This is not taking it upon ourselves to condemn those outside the Church to hell. It is telling them what

God has revealed on the subject of salvation. It is telling them that it is God's arrangement that in order to be saved they must join the Catholic Church, and persevere in it in holiness until death. It is not uncharitable to say this; but it would be a great uncharity not to let people know where they must find salvation.

If the Church is not necessary for salvation, then why did God let His Son die on the Cross? Why did He let the first 28 Popes be martyred? And why did he permit so many millions of early Christians to be slaughtered? What kind of charity is this on God's part, if the Church is not the one way to Heaven? To say that it is not is sheer blasphemy! And this is what the Liberal Heresy implies!

In the face of this Liberalism, we of St. Benedict Center know that we must continue to profess the full Catholic Faith. Our appeals to Rome, even to the Holy Father, have so far gone unanswered. Our priest is silenced, our Center interdicted, our couples unjustly refused the Sacrament of Matrimony, but we know that we must continue, like Saint Athanasius, to profess the Faith. We know as a part of the Catholic Faith that it is impossible for the Pope to define infallibly something which is contrary to a previous infallible pronouncement. Therefore we know that the dogma will eventually prevail.

Pray for us.

We take this opportunity to thank our many friends for their support in the midst of the present confusion, and to fulfill their requests by publishing this Report.

And so another chapter in the life of St. Benedict Center came to a close.

XXXI

ONE afternoon—October 28th to be exact—at mail time, Father Leonard Feeney of the Society of Jesus was seated in his chair, reading a book, and many of the Center students were at nearby tables, working hard at their studies. Mr. Haley, our faithful postman, stood in the door and said, "A registered letter for Father Feeney." Father signed the required receipt, and with the unopened letter still in his hand, he said,

"My dear boys and girls, I have been dismissed from the Jesuit Order."

He opened the letter, and in elaborate and formal Latin, that is what the message had to say.

Saint Benedict Center is situated in Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts. It is exactly on the corner of Bow and Arrow Streets, a fact which is commemorated by the bow and arrow on the Center shield, above the door. The Center's wide front windows overlook the Romanesque porch of St. Paul's Catholic Church, directly across the street. Its side windows look out on Adams House, one of the ivy covered Harvard College houses.

Any day, if you motor by, you will still see at Saint Benedict Center a group of more than seventy students, with their priest, still hard at work studying the Holy Scriptures and the lives and writings of the Fathers and the Doctors, the Popes and the Saints of the Church. They will still be there, with a longing still in their hearts for the day when a Cambridge newsboy will be heard on their street, running down from Harvard Square, with headlines in his hands, and a shout in his voice:

"EXTRA! EXTRA! EXTRA! EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS!"

Date Due

NEW BOOK

~~MAY [illegible]~~

~~JAN 3 1 '78~~

~~JUN 1 5 1988~~

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01029 6210